EVEL
ONE

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 649-2500

VOLUME IV NUMBER 4

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

OCTOBER 1930

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE FAITH OF THE SWISS BRETHREN
John Horsch

THE BACKGROUND AND CAUSES OF THE FLIGHT OF THE MENNONITES FROM RUSSIA, 1929
Benjamin H. Unruh

THE MENNONITE COLONY IN TURKESTAN
Johannes Janzen

TWO CENTURIES OF AMERICAN MENNONITE LITERATURE—AN APPRAISAL
Ernst Correll

REVIEWS AND NOTES

PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE

$1.00 a Year 35 cents a Copy

LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Seminary Knolls
Covina, California

Important Books on Mennonite History

MENNONITISCHES LEXIKON, VOLUME I, A-F, 1914-1925. *Edited by Chr. Neff, Th. D., and Chr. Hege.* Half-leather. To Mennonites, $6.00; to others, $8.00.

This is the first volume of the unique Mennonite Encyclopedia, published by the two German Mennonite editors from Weierhof, and Frankfurt a. M. The staff of contributors from Holland, Germany, and Austria is wide and authoritative, including such names as the late Dr. Bossert, Dr. Loserth, K. Vos, Dr. Rembert, Dr. Crous, Dr. Goebel, and others, and from America, John Horsch, Dr. C. Henry Smith, C. E., H. P., and H. J. Krehbiel, Dr. Elmer Johnson, David Toews, Dr. E. H. Correll, and many others. The volume is finely bound and illustrated.

DAS SCHWEITZERISCHE TAEUFER-MENNONITENTUM, TUEBINGEN, 1925. By *Dr. E. H. Correll.* $1.50 and $1.75.

The most recent, most scholarly, and most scientific monograph on the early and middle history of the Swiss Brethren and South German Mennonites. Considered by Dr. Walter Koehler of the University of Heidelberg, and John Horsch of Scottdale, Pa., as the best available work in the field. Aside from its historical value the book has interest and value as a sociological case-study of a most interesting functional group. It was reviewed from this point of view and praised by Dr. Maurer in his review in the American Journal of Sociology for March, 1926. Dr. Maurer says Correll's work "will be welcomed by those sociologists who are still interested in the possibilities of the Sermon on the Mount".

GEDENKSCHRIFT ZUM 400-JAEHRIGEN JUBILAEUM DER MENNONITEN ODER TAUFGESINNTEN, 1525-1925. Frankfurt a. M. $2.00.

This interesting and valuable collection of monographs was issued by the Conference of South German Mennonites at Ludwigshafen am Rhein in 1925 in commemoration of the Quadricentennial of the founding of the Mennonite Church at Zurich, Switzerland in January, 1525. It contains valuable studies by Dr. Ernst Crous of Berlin, Lic. Theol. B. Unruh of Karlsruhe, Dr. W. Koehler of Heidelberg, Dr. Chr. Neff of Weierhof, Dr. J. Loserth of Graz, and Chr. Hege of Frankfurt a. M. Of especial interest and value are Dr. Loserth's "Studies on Pilgram Marbeck", and the reprint of Pilgram Marbeck's "Vermahnung" of 1542.

MENNO SIMONS' COMPLETE WORKS. Elkhart, 1871. $3.50.

The only complete English edition.

HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES. Philadelphia, 1888. By *D. K. Cassel.* $1.50.

This title was once thought to be out of print. The entire small remnant has been secured by J. F. Funk and is now to be had. Not the best Mennonite History, but should be in the library of every one interested in the subject.

MAERTYRER-SPIEGEL. Lancaster, 1814. *Published by Joseph Ehrenfried.* $12.00.

A very small stock of this second American edition of the German Martyrs' Mirror has been secured. This edition is the finest produced. Bound in extra fine polished calfskin, good paper, and well-printed. The five copies on hand are all in perfect condition. An unusual opportunity for those interested in the Martyrs' Mirror. The copies are second-hand.

Most of the above titles are not to be had anywhere in the book trade in America. For sale by the Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. Postage Extra, Prices net.

289.705
M547

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Editor-in-Chief
HAROLD S. BENDER

Associate Editors

ERNST CORRELL
GUY F. HERSHBERGER
CHRISTIAN NEFF
JOHN UMBLE
BENJAMIN H. UNRUH
EDWARD YODER

VOLUME IV OCTOBER 1930 NUMBER 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 235
THE FAITH OF THE SWISS BRETHREN 241
John Horsch
THE BACKGROUND AND CAUSES OF THE FLIGHT OF THE MENNONITES FROM RUSSIA, 1929 267
Benjamin H. Unruh
THE MENNONITE COLONY IN TURKESTAN 282
Johannes Janzen
TWO CENTURIES OF AMERICAN MENNONITE LITERATURE: AN APPRAISAL 290
Ernst Correll
REVIEWS AND NOTES 303

A Quarterly Journal
PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE
SANFORD CALVIN YODER, *President*
PUBLICATION OFFICE: SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA
EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: GOSHEN, INDIANA

The Price of the Mennonite Quarterly Review is One Dollar a year, prepaid in American Territory, in Canada, and Mexico. For all other countries add twenty-five cents postage. Single copies, thirty-five cents postpaid. Subscriptions should be sent to The Mennonite Quarterly Review, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, or Goshen, Indiana.
Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Printed in U. S. A.

30035

VOLUME IV NUMBER 4

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

OCTOBER 1930

EDITORIAL

IT IS NOTHING SHORT OF REMARKABLE THAT THERE ARE TO-DAY approximately 100,000 bodily descendants of the despised and persecuted Swiss Brethren of the Reformation period, and that the great majority maintain to-day at least in substance the same faith held by their Swiss forefathers. That most desperate measures of their Protestant and Catholic persecutors failed to crush them or their faith is certainly due to the conviction with which they cherished that faith. In fact, the faith and its living expression was the heart and whole of the Swiss Brethren movement. They developed no church institution, no cult, no dogmatic structure, and practically speaking, no literature. They were the "Stillen im Lande." The faith of the Swiss Brethren is the most important thing in their history, and it is this faith which John Horsch presents in an extensive and exhaustive study, of which the first section appears in this number of the REVIEW.

The real essence of the Swiss Brethren movement and its faith has not yet been fully understood even by those scholars who have attempted sympathetically to describe the movement. The REVIEW is particularly fortunate in being able to present this discussion by a writer who has made it his life work to faithfully portray the Swiss Brethren and their faith to his contemporaries. It is of interest to note that 1930 marks forty years since Horsch, as a young man, published his first work on Mennonite History, entitled *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Mennoniten Gemeinden.* A new history of

the Swiss Brethren in Europe from his pen will soon be published. The editors believe that these articles will furnish an authoritative summary of the faith of the Swiss Brethren, well documented, and set in sharp relief against various erroneous interpretations of this faith.

In the autumn and early winter of 1929 the Mennonites of Russia came into the international spotlight as perhaps never before in their history. Fifteen thousand of them had camped at the gates of Moscow insisting upon the privilege of emigrating to Canada, and thousands more were on the way to Moscow. Some observers reported that the whole of the long-settled German colonies of Russia were on the verge of moving. The Canadian authorities however refused immediate admittance, and before negotiations to admit them to Germany for temporary relief were completed, the brutal arm of the Soviet authorities had crushed the emigration movement by deporting half of the Moscow applicants to their homes, and forbidding all further movement. About 6,000 ultimately were released and reached Germany, although it turned out on closer examination that only 4,000 of these were Mennonites.

The significance of this flight, for flight it was, cannot be overestimated. It opened the eyes of the world to the real state of affairs in Russia. The well-known protest movement followed, led by the churches of Rome and England. The Mennonite refugees had no such great objectives in mind when they stormed the passport office in Moscow, but their simple action has had results of imponderable consequences in world history. From this point of view alone it is of considerable importance to understand the movement and its causes.

For the Mennonite world the movement has other interest and other significance. It is another milestone in the long road of suffering (*"Leidensweg"*) which the Anabaptists and their descendants have had to travel down the history of the past 400 years. The suffering of these refugees who escaped and still more of their hundred thousand brethren who were forced to remain behind in a veritable prison, will perhaps serve to awaken again their brethren, whom the love of this world and its prosperity has lulled to sleep, be it in Holland, in Germany or in America. The flight has called forth another great international Mennonite relief work. But it has done more. It has planted two new Mennonite colonies, in a totally new environment, in a Spanish civilization, half a world away from their nearest brethren, a smaller unit in Brazil and the

chief unit in Paraguay. This is an event of great historical significance which the greater portion of the Mennonite world has not yet grasped. It must be the duty of the Mennonite world to foster the highest welfare of these new colonies, to provide not only for economic progress but for a preservation and stimulation of the highest type of Mennonite culture and faith. History has flung 2,500 Mennonites from all corners of Russia and Siberia into far-off South America. They are to-day starting a new Mennonite world there as their forefathers 150 years ago laid the foundations for the new Mennonite world in Russia.

For this reason in particular, the series of two articles by Professor Benjamin Unruh on the *Background and Causes of the Flight of the Mennonites from Russia,* the first of which appears in this issue, are unusually valuable. No one is better qualified than Professor Unruh to deal with this theme. He himself, a professor in the noted "Commerz-Schule" at Halbstadt, Ukraine, left Russia ten years ago with but the clothes on his back. Since then he has been the representative of the Mennonites of Russia in all their relations with the outside world. He was responsible in a large measure for the action which led to the release of the 6,000 before Moscow, and has been the responsible negotiator on behalf of the group since that time. In his archives are hundreds of documents, including many personal letters from Russia, which present a continuous and vivid picture of conditions in Russia as they have been and are now. He has a grasp of the present situation and its underlying causes which enables him to present a true picture of this epoch-making episode in Mennonite history. The REVIEW expects to present a complete account of this entire movement after the work of transportation overseas has been completed, and after Professor Unruh's two articles have appeared.

TURKESTAN IS SYNONYMOUS WITH THE END OF THE WORLD, AT least in the mind of the average person. It was the end of the world, when a caravan of Mennonite colonists trekked across the steppes of Turkestan fifty years ago to found new homes in the mountains of the interior among the Kirghis nomads. Few Mennonites in America knew of the existence of the colony, and those who knew of it for the most part thought of it in terms of the chiliastic fantasies of the misguided Claas Epp. The editor of the REVIEW chanced to meet a bishop from this Mennonite colony in Turkestan among the 6,000 refugees who had escaped into Germany in the early winter of 1929. The bishop's name is Johann Janzen. In

addition to being a bishop he proved to be a schoolteacher and a successful amateur photographer. At once an article on the Mennonite colony in Turkestan, its history and experiences under the Soviet regime, was engaged. This article is herewith presented. Bishop Janzen wishes to remind the readers that the entire article was written from memory without the aid of any documents or books, all of which had been left behind in Turkestan. The REVIEW is grateful for this fresh and interesting account from the pen of Bishop Janzen, and regrets its inability to reproduce some of the splendid pictures which he was able to bring with him on his 5,000 mile flight from Aulie Ata to Hamburg. Bishop Janzen has joined the new Mennonite colony in southern Brazil.

ON ACCOUNT OF ITS LENGTH, THE CRITICAL DISCUSSION BY DR. Correll, one of the editors of the REVIEW, and of the bibliography of American Mennonite literature entitled "Two Centuries of American Literature, 1727-1928," has been taken out of the review section proper. Dr. Correll had promised this discussion to the January number of the REVIEW. He has made his discussion the vehicle of a great deal of valuable comment on the Mennonite historiography.

The books reviewed in this issue are all on the present situation in Russia. All are also German, three of them being published in Germany, and one by a Mennonite publisher in America. The present desperate plight of the Mennonites in Russia makes these reviews very timely.

Two special "Notes" complete the section on "Reviews and Notes." The one is a document recently come to light, which accompanies the article on the Mennonite Colony in Turkestan which appears in this issue. The other "Note," is a communication of interest and value from Dr. Whitley of the (English) Baptist Historical Society throwing light on the relation of John Smyth, the early Baptist leader, and the Dutch Mennonites.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHN HORSCH: Mennonite Historian and Author, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

BENJAMIN H. UNRUH: Formerly Professor in the Mennonite College at Halbstadt, Russia, now Professor in the Technical University at Karlsruhe, Germany, and European agent of the Mennonites of Russia.

JOHANNES JANZEN: Formerly Bishop at Nicolaipol, Turkestan, now one of the emigrant refugees who fled from Russia in the autumn of 1929, emigrated to the new Mennonite colony in the State of Santa Catharina, Brazil.

ERNST CORRELL: Professor in the Graduate School of the American University, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR W. SLAGEL: Formerly Field Director of the American Mennonite Relief in the Ukraine, Russia, now living in Chicago, Illinois.

Notes: A Document on the Turkestan Colony, 1884
John Smyth and the Mennonites of Amsterdam—
A Communication

Books: Notbuch
Deutscher Todesweg
Notschreie aus Russland
Bilder aus Soviet-Russland

Respecting the motives and aims of the Swiss Brethren, in stepping out of the national church and organizing themselves as a church, the contemporary chronicler Caspar Braitmichel, said,

"Flesh and blood and human forwardness (i. e., such considerations as are of a political, social, or economic nature) *did by no means lead them to take this step; for they well knew what would fall to their lot to suffer and endure in consequence."*

THE FAITH OF THE SWISS BRETHREN

JOHN HORSCH

*Introductory Discussion**

Source material for the study of the faith of the early Swiss Brethren is not plentiful. This is partly due to the fact that the founders and leaders of the Swiss Brethren Church had very short careers. Conrad Grebel died in prison in the summer of 1526, Felix Manz was executed by drowning in January, 1527, Michael Sattler was burned at the stake in May of the same year, Wolfgang Uliman and Johannes Brötli suffered martyrdom in 1528, and George Blaurock was burned at the stake in the following year. The situation in the state churches would have been similar if their leaders had died within from two to four years after the establishment of their churches. Furthermore the founders and leaders of the early Swiss Brethren lacked the opportunity to publish their writings. Their petitions for permission to use the printed page to state and defend their doctrine were never granted them by the authorities. Yet, they found it possible to publish, though probably not in Switzerland, their confession of faith, *Brüderliche Vereinigung* (the Schlatt or Schleitheim articles of 1527),[1] the hymn book

* Detailed bibliography will be given at the conclusion of the entire series of articles.

1 Of the *Brüderliche Vereinigung* (Brotherly Union) two editions from the year 1527 are known. Zwingli remarked that copies (either in print or in manuscript) were in possession of practically all "Anabaptists." Zwingli translated the seven articles of this confession into Latin and published them with his reply in his work *In Catabaptistarum Strophas Elenchus,* (Zwingli's *Opera,* vol. III, Zurich, 1832, pp. 356-437; Jackson, S. M., *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli, the Reformer of German Switzerland,* Philadelphia, 1901, pp. 123-258). John Calvin translated the seven articles into French and published them with his counter-arguments in his book *Brieve Instruction* (*Corpus Reformatorum,* vol. VII of Calvin's works, pp. 45-142). A translation of this book was published under the title *A short instruction for to arme all good Christian people agaynst the pestiferous errours of the common secte of Anabaptistes.* (The last page has the statement, "From Geneue the first of June A. D. 1544"). A Dutch translation of this book was also published. The seven articles constituting the main part of the confession were printed in various English and German books on Mennonite history. Dutch editions of the *Brüderliche Vereinigung* were printed in 1560 and 1565. It was also reprinted in *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* vol. V, The Hague, 1909, pp. 582-620. Reprints in German were issued by Walther Köhler, *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation,* vol. II, part 3, 1908, and Heinrich Böhmer, *Lietzmann, Kleine Texte,* No. 50, Bonn, 1910.

Ausbund,[1*] and an account of the martyrdom of Michael Sattler together with one of his letters. Heinrich Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli as the head pastor of the state church of Zurich, refers to a number of booklets of the Brethren;[2] whether they were merely in manuscript (like most of the writings of the Hutterian Brethren), or in printed form is not known since these booklets are lost with the exception of one which Bullinger published as an appendix to his larger work against the Brethren which was printed in 1561.

Naturally the sources available differ widely in value and trustworthiness.[3] The opponents and persecutors of the Brethren

---

1* At least fourteen editions of the *Ausbund* were printed in America. On this work cf. Wolkan, R., *Die Lieder der Wiedertäufer,* Berlin, 1903; Bender, H. S., *The First Editions of the Ausbund,* in Mennonite Quarterly Review, April, 1929; Ramaker, A. J., *Hymns and Hymn Writers Among the Anabaptists,* Mennonite Quarterly Review, the same number. Various hymns, or parts of hymns, of this collection were translated into English by H. S. Burrage and published in his book, *Baptist Hymn Writers and Their Hymns,* Portland, Me., 1888. Prose translations of a number of the most valuable of these hymns, by Manz, Blaurock, and others, were printed in the great Book of Martyrs of the Mennonites (including the Swiss Brethren) and Hutterites which was first published in the Dutch language in 1669 by Thieleman J. van Braght. Those who translated this work into English, not being aware that these hymns were available in the language in which they were originally written, made the translations from the Dutch prose. (*The Bloody Theatre or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians, Translated from the Dutch,* Elkhart, Ind., 1886, pp. 400, 415 f.)

2 Bullinger, H., *Der Widertöufferen ursprung, fürgang, Secten, wäsen, fürneme vnd gemeine irer leer Artickel, ouch jre gründ, vnd warumb sy sich absünderind vnnd ein eigne kirchen anrichtind, mit widerlegung vnd antwort vff alle vnd yede jre gründ vnd artickel, etc.,* Zurich, 1561, Vorrede and fol. 199 b, 213 b, 130 b. The chronicler Johannes Kessler, of St. Gall, also speaks of "little books" of the Brethren. (*Sabbata,* herausgegeben vom Historischen Verein des Kantons St. Gallen, St. Gallen, 1902, p. 143). It is possible that Kessler had in mind Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier's booklets, printed in Strasburg and Nikolsburg in Moravia, which he mentions in other places. (*Ibid.,* pp. 144 and 150). Hubmaier's masterful defense of believers' baptism must have been highly prized by the Brethren. He, with his followers, differed from the Swiss Brethren on the point of nonresistance as is evident from his writings, especially from his book *On the Sword.* During his last imprisonment he offered to "stand still" and refrain from practicing the ordinances of Christ until a General Council (of Western Christendom) would decide the controverted points. While this partial recantation failed to satisfy his persecutors and to prevent his execution, it obviously served to dishearten his followers and to weaken the influence of his writings among all so-called Anabaptists.

3 The quality of some of the polemical writings of the opponents of the Brethren may be judged from the following sentences taken from Zwingli's last book against them, entitled, *Elenchus*: "As often as you confess Christ (by 'you' I mean your leaders) you make a confession that is worse than that of the demons. For they had experienced His power in such measure that they sincerely confessed Him to be the Son of God. But you, when you confess Him, do it hypocritically," etc. (*Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli,* edited by S. M. Jackson, Philadelphia, 1901, p. 150). Various damaging statements regarding the Swiss Brethren have been repeated by recent writers of important works on church history on the authority of this book of Zwingli, or on the statement of other authors who had their information from this book, in spite of the fact that the book is fiercely polemical, many of its statements being clearly based on hearsay. It is without question untrustworthy as a historical source.

were obviously in many instances careless and inaccurate in statements regarding their faith and practice. Even court records giving the testimony of witnesses as to their teaching and practice have been found frequently to contradict well-established facts. Also the testimony of the Brethren themselves regarding their faith which was given before judicial courts, seems sometimes to have been inaccurately reported.[4] But though the trustworthy source material is meagre, it is not inadequate for ascertaining their position on the various points of faith and practice. The material consists of records of hearings given imprisoned Brethren, letters of Conrad Grebel and others, hymns, petitions to authorities, accounts of discussions (debates), references found in letters of various contemporaries and statements of chroniclers, court proceedings and sentences passed by courts, decrees of the authorities against them, polemical writings of Zwingli, Oecolampad, Bullinger, Schmidt, Gast, Seyler, and others.

Relation to Menno Simons

The Swiss Brethren were the older branch of the religious body which is to-day known as the Mennonite Church. Their founders were loyal followers of Ulrich Zwingli[5] until he decided

---

[4] For example, when Conrad Grebel is made to refer to baptism on confession of faith as *Wiedertaufe* (rebaptism). (Egli, E., *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren* 1519-1533, Zürich, 1879, p. 313). The Swiss Brethren persistently protested against the use of this designation. The magistrates anxiously sought testimony against the Brethren, and this fact may be partly responsible for the obvious bias of some of the testimony. There are clear indications of untrustworthiness. For example, Dr. Sebastian Hofmeister, formerly head pastor at Schaffhausen, gave damaging testimony in the court of Zurich against Manz and others. He stated also that Conrad Grebel had visited him at Schaffhausen and attempted to persuade him to accept his view of infant baptism, but without success. (*Ibid.*, p. 309 f.) However, there is convincing proof that Hofmeister, after Grebel's visit, not only believed that infant baptism is unscriptural but preached this view from the pulpit. This proof is contained in a resolution of the Council of Schaffhausen dated August 10, 1525, and in a letter of the Council to the University of Basel, of the same date. It was partly, perhaps principally, because of his public denunciations of infant baptism that the Council ordered Hofmeister to leave the city. (Bächtold, C. A., *Die Schaffhauser Wiedertäufer in der Reformationszeit, in Beiträge zur vaterlaendischen Geschichte,* herausgegeben vom Historisch-antiquarischen Verein des Kantons Schaffhausen, Part 7, Schaffhausen, 1900, p. 92 f.) For another illustration of the unreliability of recorded court testimony Cf. *Heinrich Bullingers Reformationsgeschichte,* herausgegeben von J. J. Hottinger und H. H. Vögeli, vol. I, Frauenfeld, 1838, p. 146 f. While the pertinent court depositions, in particular those at Zurich, are of undoubted value, they must not be uncritically used. Many of these depositions are clearly untrue to fact.

[5] Many writers have freely recognized the fact that the leaders of the Swiss Brethren had been sincere followers of Zwingli. Cf. Note 49. The division was

in favor of a union of church and state[6] which involved various modifications of his doctrinal position as we shall see.[7] The first congregation of the Swiss Brethren was organized in January, 1525, at Zurich.

The Mennonites of America have a special interest in the history of the early Swiss Brethren, for the reason that a large majority of them are of Swiss descent. Besides those Mennonite immigrants who came directly from Switzerland, many who came to America from Germany, France, Holland, Poland, Austria and Russia were descendants of refugee emigrants from Switzerland who had settled in these countries.

The question of the doctrinal position of the early Swiss Brethren is one of particular historical interest and importance. Unfortunately the opinion prevails largely among historians that previous to the labors of Menno Simons all so-called Anabaptists, the Swiss Brethren not excepted, held diverse fanatical views, that their teachings were favorably modified through his influence and that the history of the Mennonites actually begins with Menno Simons.

Menno Simons forsook the Roman Catholic Church and was baptized in January, 1536—eleven years after the organization of the first Swiss Brethren Church. His influence could not possibly have reached the Swiss before 1538. He never came south as far as Switzerland nor even to southern Germany. Not until fourteen years after his death were some of his more important writings translated into German and made accessible to the Swiss. His field of labor was Holland and northern Germany.

There is adequate source material giving definite information on the doctrinal position of the Swiss Brethren before the period of Menno Simons' labors, showing conclusively that their doctrine did not undergo any change through his influence. Moreover, they never accepted certain teachings peculiar to the doctrinal system of Menno.[8] But notwithstanding these differences there was a remarkable agreement in doctrine and practice between the Swiss

---

the result of their insistence on an immediate separation from Romanism and on the separation of church and state, to which Zwingli would not consent.

[6] That both Luther and Zwingli in their earlier periods defended the principle of the independence of the church from the state is now commonly conceded by students of church history. Cf. a statement to the point by Professor Walther Köhler in *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, vol. IV, Leipzig, 1927, p. 29.

[7] "It must be admitted," says Wilhelm Hadorn, "that not only Zwingli but also other Swiss and South German reformers e. g., Oecolampad and Capito, originally held similar views as the Anabaptists [*Swiss Brethren*]" (*Die Reformation in der deutschen Schweiz*, Leipzig, 1928, p. 104).

Brethren and the Brethren of the North, and the former at a later date also adopted the name Mennonite. The early Swiss Brethren (of Switzerland, South Germany and the Tyrol), the followers of Menno Simons (in the Netherlands and North Germany), and the Hutterian Brethren (principally in Moravia), while separate and distinct from each other, were nevertheless simply three phases of one movement—one of the most important and powerful movements in the history of the Christian Church. The Hutterites differed from the Swiss Brethren and the Mennonites of the North by their practice of a free will communism of love.

I

Was the Swiss Brethren Movement an Economic and Social Class Struggle or a Religious Movement?

Certain Socialist authors have defended the thesis that the movement which resulted in the inception of the Swiss Brethren

---

[8] Menno Simons differed from the Swiss Brethren principally on the question of the inception of Jesus' body in the incarnation and on the degree of severity in church discipline. When the Swiss Brethren sent two of their ministers to Menno for a conference, he received them as brethren. The supposition of certain of his opponents that he later excommunicated the Swiss, is contrary to fact. However, the Swiss and the Netherland Brethren were separate bodies during Reformation times. In the debate of Frankenthal, in South Germany between the Swiss Brethren and the theologians of the Reformed state church of the Palatinate, in 1571, the former were accused of teaching Menno Simons' view of the incarnation. They stated in reply that they were never of one mind with Menno on this point, and added: "We disclaim responsibility for Menno's teaching." (*Protocoll, Das ist Alle handlung des gesprechs zu Franckenthal inn der Churfürstlichen Pfalz mit denen so man Widertäuffer nennet, Heidelberg,* 1571, pp 171, 175). The late Dutch Mennonite Historian Karel Vos was of the opinion that the Swiss Brethren were more conservative in theology and laid greater stress on doctrine than Menno. As a matter of fact, the larger portion of Menno Simons' writings, as well as of the writings of Dirk Philips, his principal co-worker, are devoted to setting forth and defending doctrine. Menno taught that one of the objects of discipline is to keep the church free from unscriptural teaching and practice. Two influential ministers, Adam Pastor and Francis Reines Kuyper, were excommunicated with his approval for persistence in propagating unscriptural doctrine. The Waterlander Mennonites of Holland have been supposed to be less conservative in theology than the other Mennonite groups, yet they were the first in Holland to adopt a confession of faith (written in 1577, and printed for the first time in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen,* vol. XXXXIV, Leiden, 1904, pp. 145-156). The leader of the Waterlanders, Hans de Ries, was the outstanding defender of orthodoxy against the Unitarian Socinians. (*Ibid.,* vol. IV, p. 38). The Brethren of Switzerland and South Germany never set up a confession of faith besides the seven articles of Schlatt which treat on the points on which they differed from the Protestant state churches. In 1660 some of the Swiss Brethren churches in Alsace adopted a confession drawn up by Brethren of the lower countries, namely the Dortrecht Confession of 1632. As concerns insistence on the importance of Scriptural orthodoxy there was no difference between the Swiss Brethren and the Brethren of the lower countries; there was perfect harmony on the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

Church can be traced to social and economic roots. They are of the opinion that the Brethren were originally a "disinherited" and "outlawed" class, and that this accounts for their dissent from the Protestant state churches. These writers hold, in other words, that the Swiss Brethren movement was a class struggle similar in some respects to modern Socialism. Recently even a theological writer, Dr. H. Richard Niebuhr, has published a book defending this view.[9] If this thesis were historically true it would mean that the movement was not fundamentally religious and that, consequently, Christian doctrine was to the Brethren rather incidental and secondary. It would follow that a study of their faith and religious practice could be of only minor importance.

The founders and first leaders of the Swiss Brethren Church were not by any means men of the socially or economically lower strata. Apparently all writers on this phase of church history agree that Zwingli prized Conrad Grebel's co-operation in the reformation movement before Grebel withdrew from his leadership. Both Grebel and Manz were considered qualified by Zwingli for positions as teachers in the theological school which was to be established at Zurich. Simon Stumpf, Wilhelm Reublin, Johannes Brötli, and Hans Marquart were priests; Michael Sattler was the prior of a cloister, George Blaurock and Wolfgang Uliman (the latter of a family of high social rank in St. Gall) were monks in a famous cloister at Coire. Martin Weniger, the principal spokesman of the Brethren in the great debate of Zofingen, in 1532, was a well educated man, as were also some others of their early leaders who are not here named.

Not only were the founders and most of the early leaders of the Swiss Brethren men of the higher social strata but the same is true also of many of their friends and patrons who rendered them such aid as it was possible for them to give. Heinrich Bullinger, in his first book against the Brethren, made the statement that if it had not been contrary to the desires of certain persons, he would have presented damaging evidence against them.[10] The "certain

---

[9] *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, New York, 1929. From the hypothesis that the determining factors in the rise of the denominations were social and economic, a prominent American Socialist author has made the deduction that personal social and economic considerations on the part of the church leaders constitute the life nerve of religion, and that the churches would soon pass into history if pecuniary recompense were refused the preachers. This writer is evidently not aware that certain "Anabaptist" groups have existed for centuries without a salaried or even a supported ministry.

[10] *"Wenn es etwelcher personen halb fug hette."* Bullinger, H., *Von dem unverschampten fräfel, ergerlichen verwyrren vnnd unwarhafftem leeren der selbs-*

persons" whose desires Bullinger saw himself obliged to respect were clearly men of the upper classes, in all probability members of the Council who demanded that the damaging reports about the Brethren, which were founded on mere hearsay must not be published as facts. (The Council of Zurich was the legislative and administrative body consisting of over two hundred men.)

Again, Zwingli in his last book against the Brethren says that after they had organized themselves as a church the people of Zurich were by no means a unit on the question of the attitude to be taken toward them. "Throughout the city," he says, "one counseled one way and another the other." He further states that at the time when the decree was adopted by the Council that "he should be drowned who rebaptized another," many friends of the Anabaptists openly expressed their disapproval.[11] Bullinger, in his larger work against the Brethren speaks repeatedly of their influential friends and patrons.[12] There is indeed convincing evidence that a minority of the Council frankly disapproved of their persecution. While this minority was, of course, outvoted in the passing of the cruel decrees against the Brethren, it apparently was able, until the autumn of 1526, not only to prevent executions but to have imprisoned Brethren liberated.[13]

Wolfgang Capito who was second only to Martin Butzer as the leading reformer of Strasburg, for a time frankly defended the Swiss Brethren. His friends, including Zwingli, greatly feared that he would unite with the movement. Martin Butzer, Johannes Oecolampad, Albrecht Haller, Ambrosius Blaurer, Leo Judae, who besides Zwingli were the leading Reformed theologians, were willing to overlook the peculiar teachings of the Swiss Brethren if they would cease to insist on separation from the state church.

---

gesandten Widertöuffern, vier gespräch Bücher zu verwarnenn den einfalten, Zurich, 1531, fol. 135 f.

11 Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 135f.

12 *Widertöufferen ursprung,* fol. 9b, 10a, 213b.

13 On March 6, 1526, Grebel, Manz, Blaurock and fifteen others were sentenced to imprisonment for life but, strange as it may appear, were released within a short time. At the same date a mandate was published ordering that all who would further practice rebaptism, as well as those who had once admitted that infant baptism was scriptural but had fallen back, should be "drowned without mercy." Nevertheless there was no execution during the life time of Jacob Grebel, the father of Conrad. Jacob Grebel was an exceptionally influential member of the Council and he favored a policy of toleration toward the Brethren. Zwingli says of him that he was "a nobleman and among us of highest authority." (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. VIII, Leipzig, 1914, p. 781). According to Bullinger he was "an honorable, wise and in the city of Zurich very influential and highly esteemed man" (*Reformationsgeschichte,* vol. I, p. 373). His death, on October 30, 1526, gave the signal for the beginning of bloody persecution of the Brethren in Zurich.

Zwingli's brother-in-law, Lienhard Tremp, of Bern, to the great chagrin of the reformer, for a time thought of uniting with the Brethren. Dr. Joachim von Watt, of St. Gall, at first took a friendly attitude toward them.[14]

The nobleman Hans von Waldkirch, of Schaffhausen, who later became burgomaster of his city, was a patron of the Brethren, though he could not prevent their persecution. One of the ladies of the nobility of this city, Beatrice von Fulach, formally united with them.[15] The wife of Thomas Blaurer, a Councillor of Constance and prominent patron of the Zwinglian reformation in Swabia, was, according to the testimony of the reformer Ambrosius Blaurer, "infected with this pestilence."[16] In the city of St. Gall the majority of the Council favored the toleration of the Brethren. Only in the month of May, 1525, after it had been found that their congregation in this city numbered about eight hundred souls, did the Council of St. Gall decide to take measures to suppress the movement. In the county of Grüningen, in the canton of Zurich, the magistrates for a considerable time openly defied the authorities of the canton and refused to execute the imprisoned Brethren.[17]

No one doubts that the Brethren were quickly disinherited and outlawed because of their religious beliefs and of their dissent from both Romanism and state church Protestantism. Persecution in a lighter form began very soon after the inception of the Swiss Brethren movement, even before their actual withdrawal from the national church. They organized themselves as a church in the face of threatening outlawry which soon became a reality. There is abundant proof of the erroneousness of the supposition that they constituted a disinherited class beforehand, or that any particular social class as such was responsible for their movement.

The assertion that the Swiss Brethren movement was at bottom social, economic and political, instead of religious, as it claimed to be, is not new. This assertion was frequently made by the early

---

[14] Pressel, J., *Joachim Vadian*, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 48.

[15] Bächtold, C. A., *Die Schaffhauser Wiedertäufer in der Reformationszeit*, in Beiträge zur vaterländischen Geschichte, Schaffhausen, 1900, part VII, pp. 103, 115, 117.

[16] Schiess, T., *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer*, 1509-1548, vol. I, Freiburg i. Br., 1908, p. 379.

[17] Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte*, vol. I, p. 325 f; Egli, *Actensammlung*, p. 623 f.

[18] Various reviewers of the book, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* seem to be under the impression that the author has proved his thesis. The editor of an influential religious weekly has expressed the opinion that this is the first real history of the denominations. However, as concerns the so-called Anabaptists, the author can scarcely be said to have made an attempt to prove his view.

literary opponents and persecutors of the Brethren. Zwingli averred that the Swiss Brethren movement was a "revolt and conspiracy" against the existing social and political order.[19] The Brethren, he says, "seek nothing but disturbance and confusion of affairs, both human and divine;"[20] their baptism is only "a pretext for sedition, confusion and disturbance;"[21] "it is sedition, faction, heresy, not baptism."[22] Again Zwingli says: "Anabaptism has been begun for no other purpose than to furnish an excuse for a union to plot against the government."[23] Together with other writers who approved the persecution of the Brethren Zwingli held that their religious profession was a mere cloak for social, economic, and political motives and aims, and that their piety was hypocrisy. "The hypocrisy of the Roman pope has been exposed," says Zwingli, "now we must war with hypocrisy itself."[24] In making the charge of hypocrisy these writers have persistently overlooked the fact that the supposed hypocrites endured the severest persecution and death for their faith.

But is there any evidence or proof for Zwingli's charges such as political conspiracy, social revolt and sedition? Zwingli never

---

19 Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 187. In some of his earlier writings Zwingli stated that his followers were accused of sedition and uproar. He warned them to bear such charges patiently and valiantly suffer for the faith, if need be. (E. g., (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. II, p. 321). Later, in 1531, Zwingli wrote a book in which he complains that (in Catholic countries) his followers were accused of the same crimes and offensive teachings of which (on the ground of rumors and hearsay) he held the Swiss Brethren guilty. (*Ulrich Zwingli; Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften auf das vierhundertjährige Jubiläum der Zürcher Reformation,* Zurich, 1918, p. 815.)

20 Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 137.

21 *Ibid.,* p. 128.

22 *Vadianische Briefsammlung,* vol. III, p. 114. Professor C. A. Cornelius speaks of the Swiss Brethren as "a party which, disregarding the political considerations of Zwingli and risking the danger of complete separation from him, would make the Bible the absolute authoritative rule for the reformation movement. (*Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs,* vol. II, *Die Wiedertaufe,* Leipzig, 1860, p. 18).

23 *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, p. 383. A number of modern authors wrote in a similar strain. The latest general church history in the English language has the following about the Brethren of Zurich: "As early as 1526 [!] the Zurich government had some of them drowned, chiefly on account of their anarchical opinions." (*Short History of the Christian Church,* by C. P. S. Clarke, London, 1929, p. 274). Again, an American biographer of Zwingli says: "Anabaptism in Switzerland grew up under the leadership of a few ambitious men of scandalous lives, and the fruit proved no better than the tree upon which it grew . . . . Considering their violence and lawlessness Zwingli's patience and moderation are something marvelous." (*Life of Ulrich Zwingli,* by Samuel Simpson, New York, 1902, p. 150.) The article *Vor vierhundert Jahren,* mentioned in note 39 is written in a similar tone. The general attitude taken by these Protestant authors toward the Swiss Brethren is substantially the same as that of the Roman Catholic writers of earlier centuries toward state church Protestantism.

24 Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 137.

gives any proof for such charges. He says indeed, that he could present abundant proofs of their crimes if necessity required it.[25] He urged the suppression of Anabaptism by the authorities but he failed to bring forth proofs of unlawful political activities, in fact of any political activities. And is it not reasonable to assume that the civil authorities would have had information of the facts if there was any foundation to these charges?

Not only does Zwingli fail to bring forth proofs but we have his own statements contradicting his accusations. Repeatedly he forgets himself and states that the Brethren differ from him only on minor points. He addressed the Brethren in these words: "If one looks into this matter closely it is seen that you contend only for unimportant outward things."[26] And again: "But that no one may suppose that the dissension is in regard to doctrines which concern the inner man, let it be said that they make us difficulty only because of questions such as these: whether infants or adults should be baptized and whether a Christian may be a magistrate."[27] Says J. C. Mörikofer, in his biography of Zwingli, concerning his last book against the Brethren: "It must be conceded that Zwingli in

---

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[26] *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. III, p. 406. Zwingli often expressed the view that the main error of the Brethren consisted in laying too much stress on outward things, such as baptism. He says: "Why do you continually contend for outward things?" (*Zwinglis Works,* vol. III. p. 407). "On account of outward things they place a serious hindrance in the way of the word of God.—For the sake of an outward sign [baptism] they destroy all Christian peace." (*Ibid.,* vol IV, p. 206). "On account of certain outward things which are not of great importance they have destroyed love." (*Ibid.,* p. 216). The statement that the Brethren differed from the Zwinglian state church "only in external things" was made likewise by the theologians of the state church in the discussions at Zofingen. They said: "We are of one mind in the leading articles of faith, and our controversy has to do only with external things which are not in accordance with the gospel. For the sake of these things they [the Brethren] disown us. If they would stand with us in these points, we should be able to accomplish much good." (*Handlung oder Acta gehaltener Disputation und Gespräch zu Zoffingen in Berner Biet mit den Widertöuffern,* Bern, 1532, fol. 27 b.)

[27] *Ibid.,* vol. III, p. 872. Wolfgang Capito, of Strasburg, in May 1527, addressed the magistrates of Horb, in Württemberg, on behalf of a number of Swiss Brethren prisoners at that place as follows: "As concerns the principal articles and vital points of faith, they do not err at all." He adds that this will become fully evident in the last day. (Baum, J. W., *Capito and Butzer, Strassburgs Reformatoren,* Elberfeld, 1860, p. 375). Johann Jakob Breitinger, head of the state church of Zurich, wrote in 1615: "The Anabaptists [Swiss Brethren] have their peculiar ideas but teach nevertheless faith in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. They do not hold errors which would cause a man to be lost, but such as have been taught by some of the old church fathers. And no one can deny that the Lutherans do not defend lesser but greater errors, and besides defame and condemn us, while we none-the-less are of the opinion that we can consider them our brethren if they would only take a friendly attitude toward us." (Mörikofer, J. C., *J. J. Breitinger und Zürich,* Leipzig, 1873, p. 150). At a a later date Breitinger expressed similar sentiments. (*Ibid.,* p. 153).

this book presents in lurid colors as facts that which came to his ears as rumour."[28] The Reformed church historian Professor Paul Wernle of the University of Basel, wrote: "Zwingli failed to realize how great a wrong he did the Anabaptists [the Swiss Brethren] by heaping on their heads all shameful accusations."[29]

In support of the hypothesis of the social and economic origin of the so-called Anabaptists Dr. H. Richard Niebuhr says: "From violent revolution the path of development led through stubborn nonresistance . . . ."[30] Now, this can obviously not be said of the Swiss Brethren who were the first and oldest of the so-called Anabaptist sects. They existed as a church for about eight years before the rise of the revolutionary Munsterite sect which differed from them radically in faith and practice. The Swiss Brethren always defended and conscientiously practiced the principle of nonresistance even when they were subjected to cruel persecutions and would have been numerous enough to use force. In the town of St. Gall, for example, their congregation numbered about a thousand members. The writers who charged the Brethren with revolutionary

---

28 *Ulrich Zwingli,* vol. II, p. 72. The various charges of Zwingli against the Swiss Brethren, some of them being serious indeed, will be duly considered.

29 *Der Evangelische Glaube nach den Hauptschriften der Reformatoren,* vol. II, *Zwingli,* Tübingen, 1919, p. 355. August Baur says, on the contrary, that Zwingli's appalling accusations "are not based on mere rumor and fabrication but on valid, unquestionable testimony." He thinks that these charges can be disregarded only "if proof can be brought forth that they are inventions and falsehoods." (*Zwinglis Theologie, ihr Werden und ihr System,* vol. II, Halle, 1889, pp. 243 and 115). Baur fails, however, to inform us where any of his "valid, unquestionable testimony" may be found. As above stated, Zwingli also asserted that he could give proof, but the fact remains that both he and those who have repeated his accusations have failed to do so. In the absence of evidence from any source his incriminating description of the life and doctrine of the Brethren is unacceptable. As a matter of fact, this description is annulled by Zwingli's own contradictory statements, as shown above. Dr. Baur speaks of the Swiss Brethren as "a general dissenting church" while Zwingli often repeated the statement that they were no church. He described them as a revolutionary, criminal rabble. Baur has obviously failed to see that, if Zwingli's general description of the doctrine and life of the Brethren were true to fact, he (Zwingli) would have been justified in denying them the predicate of a Christian church.

30 *The Social Sources of Denominationalism,* p. 39. Professor Johannes Kühn, of Leipzig, says: "With the Anabaptists everything was based on a central idea. This central idea was *concretely religious.* It was Jesus' command [not only to believe in Him but] to follow Him in a holy life of fellowship." (*Toleranz und Offenbarung,* Leipzig, 1923, p. 224). The Reformed Church historian Professor Wilhelm Hadorn, states that the "Anabaptist" movement in Switzerland was "of a purely religious nature." (*Die Reformation in der deutschen Schweis,* p. 103). Professor Hans von Schubert, of Heidelberg, says of the founders of the Swiss Brethren Church: "Their motives were altogether religious." (*Revolution und Reformation im sechzehnten Jahrhundert,* Tübingen, 1927, p. 53, note 83). The late professor Emil Egli, of Zurich, wrote: "The Socialist of to-day has more in common with his Protestant neighbor than with the old Anabaptist [Swiss Brethren]. (*Die St. Galler Täufer,* Zurich, p. 39).

aims and sinister motives and asserted that under the very principle of nonresistance social and economic revolt was lurking, were not able to point to a single act of uproar, or riot, or insurrection, or refusal to pay taxes on their part.

Conrad Grebel's *Petition of Protest and Defense*[31] which he addressed to the Council of Zurich in December, 1524, was the first protest against Zwingli's insinuation of political and other non-religious aims on the part of the Brethren, and such protests were often repeated. Somewhat later a contemporary chronicler says in respect to the motives and aims of the Brethren in stepping out of the national church and organizing themselves as a church: "Flesh and blood and human forwardness (i. e., such considerations as are of a political, social, or economic nature) did by no means lead them to take this step; for they well knew what would fall to their lot to suffer and endure in consequence."[32]

There is also the theory (closely related to the error just discussed) that the movement which resulted in the inception of the Swiss Brethren Church originated in the ignoble interests, personal ambitions and disappointments of the early leaders of the Brethren, and that consequently the roots of the movement were anything but religious. It was supposed that Zwingli refused Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz his consent to their appointment as teachers in the theological school at Zurich, and that they therefore withdrew from his leadership and, proceeding on the maxim, "Divide and rule," they organized a church separate from the Zwinglian state church. But this cannot have been the case. The theological school at Zurich was not opened until June 19, 1525, several months after the Swiss Brethren Church had been established. Furthermore, Heinrich Bullinger, in his *History of the Reformation,* makes mention of the establishment of this school and states expressly that Grebel and Manz would have been eligible as teachers of Greek and Hebrew, but since they had forsaken the national church and become Anabaptists, other men were appointed.[33]

---

[31] Printed by Staub, M., *Die Beziehungen des Täufers Conrad Grebel zu seinem Schwager Vadian,* Zürich, 1895, p. 91 f, and by Walther Köhler in *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke,* Band III, Leipzig, 1914, p. 368 ff. An English translation appeared in The College Record Review Supplement, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, for January, 1926, under the title, *Conrad Grebel's Petition of Protest and Defense.*

[32] *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder,* herausgegeben von den Hutterischen Brüdern in Amerika durch Rudolf Wolkan in Wien, 1923, p. 35.

[33] *Reformationsgeschichte,* vol. I, p. 289. Early in the reformation movement Zwingli conceived a plan of dismissing some of the priests of the cathedral of Zurich

The assertion that Grebel begrudged Zwingli his position of leadership, and therefore inaugurated a new movement in which he could be leader, also contradicts Zwingli's repeated statements. A number of passages in Zwingli's writings show that, after he had decided upon the establishment of a state church, Grebel and his friends made persistent efforts to dissuade him from taking such a course. They earnestly desired and entreated him to lead out in a movement for a reformation such as was in accord with his former program—a movement for establishing a church independent of the state and recognizing the authority of Scripture alone in matters of faith and conscience. We have Zwingli's definite testimony that they, so far from seeking the honor of leadership, for a long period put forth earnest efforts to that end. Zwingli wrote in his *Book on Baptism*: "Those who among us have caused the controversy in regard to baptism have previously [namely before the abolition of the mass by the Council] often asked us to organize a new church [instead of waiting for the Council's permission to abolish Romanism]."[34] In his last book against the Brethren, entitled *Elenchus,* he says: "You have asserted oftener than I can say that all will be well if I join you."[35] In at least four other instances Zwingli repeated and confirmed the statement that they urged him to lead out in the proposed movement,[36] and this testimony is corroborated by Bullinger.[37] Notice also Zwingli's statement that before the abolishment of the mass in Zurich he was often asked to

---

and using their benefices (the income from large endowments for saying mass) for organizing a theological school. Evidently this was previous to the time when the more radical reform friends objected to using the benefices from such endowments for evangelical purposes. Zwingli promised Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz his recommendation for positions in the proposed school, and this meant that their appointment was sure whenever the plan could be carried into effect. The Council of Zurich, however, at that time did not permit the deposition of any priest, or using such benefices for this purpose. "Besides," says Bullinger, "these men [Grebel and Manz] became possessed of the spirit of Anabaptism to such extent that they were no longer interested in anything whatever except to promote their Anabaptism." (*Bullinger, Reformationsgeschichte,* vol. I, p. 238). George Finsler, joint editor of Zwingli's Works, states that Felix Manz was disappointed by the election of Jacob Ceporin as professor of Hebrew at the time of the opening of the theological school at Zurich. (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, p. 388). Many have repeated this opinion on the authority of earlier writers without considering the absurdity of the idea than an Anabaptist could be appointed to this position. The fact that historians of repute defend such an opinion indicates that the impartial study of Mennonite history from the sources has been neglected.

34 *Zwinglis Werke, vol. IV,* p. 206.

35 Jackson, *Select Works,* p. 176.

36 *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, pp. 169, 171, 591; Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 132.

37 *Widertöufferen ursprung,* fol. 9 a.

resign his office in the national church and was promised definite financial support if he would do so.[38]

II

The Doctrine of the Scriptures

During the Reformation period the Swiss Brethren were not only severely persecuted but they were charged with various unsound, fanatical teachings. Two of these charges in particular have been repeated by recent writers,[39] namely that they followed Thomas Münzer in respect to his doctrine of the authority of Scripture and of perfectionism. Münzer taught that the Spirit, instead of Scripture, is the final authority and that new revelations beside and above Scripture are needed. Thus he opened the way for radical individualism and fanaticism. He believed that the Holy Spirit works independently of Scripture and of the preaching of the Word, and that the spiritually enlightened Christian can dispense with the Bible. He spoke disparagingly of the letter of Scripture as of small importance, and did not deem it necessary to abandon infant baptism although he taught that it is contrary to Scripture.

The supposition that the Brethren held such views regarding the authority of Scripture is based on the testimony of their adversaries and is quite untenable as we shall see.

On December 18, 1523, Conrad Grebel wrote to Joachim von Watt (called Vadian), of St. Gall, complaining of Zwingli's compromising attitude as concerns the authority of the Scriptures. He said that in Zurich the Word was "compromised, thrust back, fettered." He stated that the great religious debate which had been held in Zurich on October 26-28 of the same year on the question of the images and the mass had not resulted in giving the Word free course. On the contrary, he said, the divine doctrine was dis-

---

[38] *Zwinglis Werke*, vol. IV, p. 405. Professor Walther Köhler, of Heidelberg, thinks that "ignoble interests, selfishness and personal vanity" played a part in the inception of the Swiss Brethren movement, nevertheless he censures as unjust the attitude of Zwingli in discrediting the whole movement as ignoble and even seditious. (*Zwinglis Werke*, vol. IV, p. 379). As a matter of fact, it is impossible to prove the charge of ignoble motives, whether this charge is advanced by representatives of Romanism and the state church type of Protestantism against the Brethren, or by Romanists against Luther, Zwingli or Calvin.

[39] Holl, K., *Luther und die Schwärmer*, in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. I, second edition, Tübingen, 1923; Böhmer, H., *Thomas Müntzer und das jüngste Deutschland*, in Gesammelte Aufsätze, Gotha, 1927. The erroneous view that the Brethren substituted the authority of the Spirit for the authority of Scripture is defended in the article *Vor vierhundert Jahren*, by C. S., in Reformierte Schweizer Zeitung, vol. IV, No. 45 to vol. V, No. 2.

regarded by the leaders of the reformation movement.[40] Previous to this debate Zwingli had repeatedly and emphatically said that the Council is a secular institution, not an authority in religious matters. He had taught that religious questions must be decided by the church on the authority of Scriptures alone without regard to the attitude of the civil authorities.[41] But in the course of the debate he saw best to change his attitude on this vital point.

Zwingli had confidently believed and fully expected that at the conclusion of the debate just mentioned the Council of Zurich would permit the abolition of that cornerstone of Roman Catholicism, the mass, which he believed to be blasphemy against God. On the second day of the debate he said that, if the Council delayed this matter further, or rendered a decision contrary to Scripture, he would preach against them and do contrary to their orders.[42] However, before the conclusion of the debate the attitude of the Council toward immediate practical reformation appeared problematical. In the final session Zwingli sounded a note of warning saying that nothing must be done without the orders of the Council,[43] thus reversing his former attitude and obviously compromising the principle of the authority of Scripture.[44] While in theory he, as formerly, held the doctrine of the sole authority of Scripture, he in fact forsook this doctrine taking the position that in matters of practical reformation the Council was the authority to be heeded.[45] After the de-

---

40 *Vadianische Briefsammlung,* vol. III, p. 50.

41 Among Zwingli's emphatic statements to the point from the preceding period are the following: "One should not ask the government in such matters, for the civil authorities are not ordained to rule over the Word of God and Christian liberty, but only over things that are of a secular nature, as I have abundantly shown above. . . . So we readily see that the authority which the government has over our bodies and temporal possessions does not extend over the soul." (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. II, p. 514 f). And again: "Whenever the civil authorities command that which is contrary to the divine truth, or forbid that which is in accordance with it, they who believe the Word of God must suffer death rather than yield. If they fail to do this, they are not followers of Christ." (*Ibid.,* p. 503).

42 *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. II, 1908, pp. 775, 784.

43 *Ibid.,* p. 800.

44 In the above mentioned letter to Vadian Conrad Grebel declared Zwingli's attitude to be an obvious compromise. Franz Kolb, who was later one of the leading reformers of Bern, in a letter to Martin Luther, in 1524, deplored the great discord among the Evangelicals arising from the fact that some had retained the unscriptural ceremonies to a larger and others to a lesser degree. "It is impossible," he says, "that unity be brought about except by discarding all human inventions and following the word of Christ alone." (Eissenlöffel, L., *Franz Kolb, Sein Leben und Wirken* (Diss.), Erlangen, 1893, p. 95). In Zurich the point causing a division was the retention of the mass itself.

45 The pending religious questions were viewed principally from the political standpoint by the Council. From that angle the further observance of the mass was undoubtedly desirable; indeed, considered from the immediate political viewpoint, the safest policy would have been to check the reformation movement.

bate mentioned above, Zwingli and some of his assistants rendered "Opinions" strongly advising the Council to order the abolition of the mass. At the same time he disapproved of proceeding in matters of practical reformation without such orders. He obliged his followers to be contented with the observance of mass in the churches until the Council would order its abolition.[46] For about eighteen months longer, namely until Easter, 1525, mass was said by order of the Council in all churches of the city and canton of Zurich.

Parenthetically it may be observed here that the mass is a chief foundation stone of Romanism. According to Roman Catholic doctrine the sacrifice of Calvary must be repeated through the mass, necessitating a literal priesthood, or priestly class. It is held that the bread or host in the Eucharist (mass) is Christ's body in a literal sense, or in other words, it is Christ himself, and is to be worshipped. Christ is supposed to be offered up again whenever mass is said. The one great sarcifice made once for all for sin is believed to be insufficient; the priests must offer up Christ afresh. To make sure of personal salvation people were advised to have masses said on their own behalf. Many created funds the income of which was to be used for saying mass.

The author of the standard biography of Zwingli, Dr. Rudolf Staehelin, says to the point: "The prolonged observance of

---

Zwingli now adopted a policy which led to a virtual surrender of the church to the Council. Professor P. Tschackert says to the point: "It was cast in Luther's teeth that he subjected the church to the ruling princes; however, Zwingli went much farther in this respect. He completely delivered up the church to the civil authorities." (*Die Entstehung der lutherischen und reformierten Kirchenlehre,* Göttingen, 1910, p. 254). And yet, the Council's interest in religion was only secondary. Burgomaster Caspar Röust, the chairman of the Council, in the debate of October, 1523, made the significant statement: "I cannot well discuss these things; I speak of them as a blind man would speak of colors." (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. II, p. 802). On the same occasion the general attitude of the population was forcefully expressed by the prior of the Dominican cloister who said: "I shall be well satisfied with any decision my lords [the Council] may render as regards these matters, and shall willingly obey them." (*Ibid.,* p. 775).

[46] Zwingli's position regarding the question of practical reformation without the consent of the civil authorities is made clear in a letter to his friends Berthold Haller and Franz Kolb, the reformers of Bern. They had asked his advice concerning the abolition of mass and the introduction of evangelical worship. Zwingli replied in a letter dated October 11, 1527, that the Lord's supper should not be observed before the Council of Bern had officially decided upon the general abolition of mass. Otherwise, he said, it was to be feared that the Council after officially introducing evangelical worship, would yet permit the celebration of mass, and this would result in a permanent division of the church, "such as obtains in Bohemia," (where the Bohemian Brethren existed as a body separate from the Roman Church). *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. VIII, p. 100. Zwingli's attitude on this point was obviously one of expediency. There is, by the way, convincing evidence of the erroneousness of the idea that toleration for various creeds under one civil government was foreign to the thinking of the leaders of state church Protestantism.

the mass was felt to be an unbearable burden of conscience after it had been spoken of [by Zwingli and others] in plain words as an insult to God."[47] Zwingli regretted the vacillating attitude of the Council in matters of practical reformation but nevertheless decided definitely that the good will and support of the state was needed for the success of the reformation movement. As a matter of fact, the civil authorities would permit separation from Romanism only on the condition that they would have control of the new church. To surrender the church to state control meant in turn an easy and complete outward success of the reformation movement in those cantons and countries whose civil authorities would be won for the movement. By abandoning his former reformation program and permitting the state to rule the church Zwingli consented to a compromise which involved a vital modification of Zwingli's doctrinal position and in various respects proved detrimental to the best interests of the church. Under existing conditions the new departure necessarily led to a union of the church and state and the persecution of dissenters, eventually causing state church Protestantism to stain its hands with the blood of devoted fellow Christians. Professor C. A. Cornelius, of Munich, having stated that Zwingli left the decision of important religious questions to the heads of the state, says: "From the viewpoint of the state Zwingli's attitude was correct and it secured for his reform movement great political advantages, but from the evangelical viewpoint it was obviously inconsistent and was sure to lead to discord within and division of the reform party."[48]

Zwingli evidently believed that there would be no serious difficulty in persuading his friends and co-workers as a whole to follow him in a course which eventually would mean the surrender of the church to state control. In this hope he was altogether disappointed. The vital change in his reformation program cost him some of his most faithful followers who had from sincere conviction united with the evangelical party.[49] They realized that the question of the relation between church and state had been decided in a way which

---

47 *Huldreich Zwingli, Sein Leben und Wirken,* vol. I, Basel, 1895, p. 349.

48 *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs,* vol. II, *Die Wiedertaufe,* Leipzig, 1860, p. 18.

49 That those who renounced Zwingli's leadership at this time had been of his most loyal followers cannot be doubted. Rudolf Staehelin says, "They were of his most faithful and resolute friends." (*Huldreich Zwingli; sein Leben und Wirken; nach den Quellen dargestellt,* vol. I, Basel, 1895, p. 462). Wilhelm Hadorn states that "they were of the most faithful and zealous of Zwingli's adherents." (*Kirchengeschichte der reformierten Schweiz,* Zurich, 1907, p. 68). C. A. Bächtold remarks that "they were originally the best friends of Zwingli." (*Schaffhauser Wiedertäufer,* p. 74).

would bring the church into the bondage of the state, somewhat similar as the former bondage of Rome. The establishment of a true New Testament church would become impossible. These men were determined to be steadfast in defending the position which Zwingli had formerly held: that the authority of the state cannot be substituted for the authority of Scripture. Urban Heberle, a historian of the Lutheran Church of Württemberg, says: "Zwingli was confronted with the need of defending himself against a party which had drawn the consequences of his own theory. Without doubt, therefore, his former intimate friends, who were now his antagonists, had a right to accuse him of abandoning his previous position."[50] Conrad Grebel, according to a report made by Landvogt Berger, of Grüningen in the canton Zurich, stated that "Zwingli has led me into this thing and has afterwards changed his mind on various points."[51]

Grebel's *Petition of Protest and Defense*[52] is an eloquent plea to recognize the sole authority of Scripture and dispose of religious questions by it alone. He earnestly petitioned the authorities to "let the truth be the truth" and discard all doctrine and practice that were not founded on the Word, for Scripture alone, he said, is "the eternal truth of God."

In September, 1524, Conrad Grebel and his friends wrote a letter to Thomas Münzer giving a brief account of the origin of the movement with which they were identified.[53] They were shown, he says, the errors of Romanism by the evangelical preachers (Zwingli and others), but as concerns the true Christian life, there was no change for the better, and the ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church were yet in vogue. "When we ourselves took to hand the Scriptures and studied them with reference to various articles, we were in a measure instructed and led to recognize the existing lack." "The cause of all failure is the time-serving attitude [on the part of the preachers], setting aside the divine Word and adulterating it with the human word." "The divine Word is disregarded and the word of the anti-papal preachers which also is at variance with the divine Word is accepted."[54]

---

[50] *Die Anfänge des Anabaptismus in der Schweiz,* Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, vol. III, Stuttgart, 1858, p. 259 f.

[51] Egli, *Actensammlung,* No. 797. Cf. note 60.

[52] Cf. note 31.

[53] Printed by Cornelius, *Geschichte,* p. 240 ff; *Gedenkschrift zum 400jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten oder Taufgesinnten,* Ludwigshafen, 1925, pp. 89-102. An English translation, by Walter Rauschenbusch, is found in the American Journal of Theology, Chicago, vol. IX, No. 1.

[54] *Gedenkschrift,* p. 90 f. In October, 1524, Conrad Grebel wrote in a letter to Vadian: "You do not realize, I know, how distressed I am over the fact that

Again Grebel says in the same place in point of the authority of Scripture:

> We ask you to discard the old ordinances of Anti-Christ . . . . and hold to the Word of God alone and be guided by it.[55]
>
> We beg and entreat you to preach with all earnestness and boldness God's Word alone, to defend and practice only divine ordinances, to consider as good and right only what may be found in clear and plain Scripture, to hate and anathematize all plans, words, ordinances, and opinions of men, those of yourself included.[56]
>
> What we are not taught by the clear word or example of Scripture, we should consider as forbidden, the same as if it were written: Do it not.[57]
>
> Again we would admonish you, do not do, teach, or set up anything according to human opinion, be it your own or that of others; and abandon again what has been so set up; and teach and establish only the clear divine Word and ordinances, including the rule of Christ (Matthew 18), in the unadulterated baptism and unadulterated Lord's Supper.[58]

The following is taken from two petitions of the Swiss Brethren of Zurich and vicinity to the council of Zurich, both of the year 1525:

> In order that we may be delivered from this tribulation [the persecution] we beg your wisdom to permit the divine Word to prevail and be the judge in these matters. For we desire to hold fast to the clear, plain, unadulterated Word of God without any human suppositions and opinions. For what is not contained in the divine Scripture, we do not desire by any means.
>
> Gracious, well-affected lords, we beg your wisdom to permit and arrange for a public discussion to which any one desiring to

---

the most learned pastors and those that are considered leaders and pillars of the Word, as indeed they are, drink the purest water but have soiled with their feet much of the water which they give their flocks to drink. (Ezek. 34:18, 19). (*Vadianische Briefsammlung,* vol. III, p. 89). In another letter he says, the compromise regarding the mass which was suggested by Zwingli and others, not long after the debate of October, 1523, indicated "diabolical prudence." (*Ibid.,* p. 52). This proposed compromise was not accepted by the civil authorities, however. Mass was said in all the churches of Zurich until a much later date.

55 *Gedenkschrift,* p. 98. In his *Protestation and Defense* Grebel says that baptism is to be administered to him "who has been *converted through the Word of God,* whose heart is changed and who desires to walk henceforth in newness of life." (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. III, p. 370).

56 *Ibid.,* p. 91. In August, 1525, Grebel said: "You should regard neither the opinion of the civil authorities nor of any man but should do only what God requires of you; and what the mouth of God has spoken, that you should heed." (Egli, *Actensammlung,* p. 397)

57 *Gedenkschrift,* p. 92.

58 *Ibid.,* p. 101.

> do so may come to be instructed from divine Scripture. If it is found from the divine Scriptures that we have erred, we shall gladly accept correction, be it in regard to baptism or other points.[59]
>
> For all things that are grounded in the Word of God we will stake and pledge our lives, honor and possessions. We beg you, gracious lords, to permit a debate, granting safe conduct to one or two of our men . . . . who, as our representatives, shall set forth all the pertinent scriptures, that every one may be able to decide whether our position is right or wrong. We desire nothing upon earth than to have these things decided according to the Word of God. We hope and believe that through the Word of God the truth will be clearly and plainly set forth and that your honors shall be able to appreciate our position.[60]

Michael Sattler, who after the death of Grebel and Manz was, besides Blaurock, the most prominent leader of the Swiss Brethren, wrote: "Let no one cause you to depart from the standard that is laid through the letter of Scripture which is sealed by the blood of Christ and of many witnesses of Jesus."[61]

Hans Treier, who was executed by drowning at Bern, in July, 1529, said: "I have held no secret meetings, but to inquirers who came to me I have set forth my faith from the Scriptures, and have always asked, if any one thought that I erred, to be instructed from divine Scripture."[62]

---

59 Egli, E., *Actensammlung,* p. 300.

60 Füssli, J. K., *Beyträge zur Erläuterung der Kirchen-Reformations-Geschichten des Schweitzerlandes,* Band II, Zuerich 1742, p. 358f. On August 9, 1525, at a time when Grebel endured severe persecution, the magistrate of the town of Grüningen reported to the Council of Zurich concerning a statement made by Grebel. Grebel had proposed a debate with Zwingli, so a number of men informed the officer, and had said, if it could be shown (from Scripture) that he was in error, he was ready to suffer death, while Zwingli, if shown to be in error, should not suffer such punishment. (Egli, *Actensammlung,* p. 379). At the same time Grebel expressed the desire that the Brethren should be permitted to defend themselves in writing for the press. (*Ibid,* p. 379).

61 *Brüderlich Vereinigung etzlicher Kinder Gottes sieben Artikel betreffend. Item ein Sendbrief Michael Sattlers an eine Gemeine Gottes samt seinem Martyrium* (1527), herausgegeben von Walther Köhler, Leipzig, 1908, p. 45. Sattler addressed his judges who sentenced him to death as follows: "Ye ministers of God, if you have neither heard nor read the Word of God, we would ask you to send for the most learned men and for the divine book of Scripture, and that they with us weigh these things in the light of the Word of God. If they show us from Holy Scripture that we err and are in the wrong, we shall gladly be taught, and recant." (*Ibid.,* p. 54).

62 Fluri, A., *Täuferhinrichtungen im Bern sechzehnten Jahrhundert,* in Berner Heim, 1896, No. 36, p. 284. Whenever opportunity presented the Brethren declared their willingness to be instructed from the Scriptures. In the lengthy discussions held in the year 1639 at Zurich the theologians of the state church referred to the fact that the Brethren often offered to be corrected from the Scriptures. (*Wahrhafftер Bericht Unsers des Burgermeisters, des Kleinen und Grossen Rahts, Worinnen grundtlich dargethan wirt unser handlungen gegen den*

In the discussion of Zofingen, in 1532, the Brethren said regarding the authority of Scripture:

> One cannot seek the praise of God more devotedly than by loyalty to His Word.[63]
>
> If we admitted this, we fear that we would not give God's Word its rightful place.[64]
>
> Much has been said but it has not been established by Scripture. . . . We do not go on opinion but demand proof from Scripture.[65]
>
> If it could be established by the Word of God, we should assuredly accept it.[66]
>
> As to the quotations which you gave outside of Scripture, we have nothing to reply.[67]

In the discussion held in Bern in 1538 the Brethren said:

> We hold that all things should be proven to ascertain what is founded on the holy Word of God, for this will stand when heaven and earth pass away, as Christ Himself says.[68]
>
> The question what was the custom three hundred years ago is not to the point, except as concerns that which is in accord with the teachings of the Gospel; which we shall gladly accept.[69]
>
> You have no Scripture whatever for this opinion. It is up to you to prove your point [by Scripture] otherwise I shall not accept it even if there came an angel from heaven.[70]

Widertaufferen, etc., Zurich, 1639, p. 24). On the other hand, the Brethren often made light of the attempts to convince them by the use of force. In derision they referred to "the executioner with his bloody hands" as "the highest doctor in Christendom" who silenced all dissent. They were convinced that their doctrine and principles were founded on Scripture, and this settled for them the question of recantation. They took their Christian profession seriously and therefore would lay down their lives rather than to suffer themselves to be convinced by the hangman. As late as the middle of the eighteenth century among the churches consisting of descendants of Swiss Brethren refugees in the Palatinate, it was definitely expected of church members to maintain loyalty to the Scriptures at any cost. In communion services in this period only those were invited to partake "who are minded, for the sake of the truth, to venture all, goods and possessions, body and even life itself." *Aus alten Briefen,* in Gemeindeblatt der Mennoniten, Karlsruhe, Baden, 1928, No. 20, p. 118.

63 *Zofingen,* p. 61 b.

64 *Ibid.,* p. 74 b.

65 *Ibid.,* p. 82 b..

66 *Ibid.,* p. 74 b.

67 *Ibid.,* p. 64 b. In the course of the discussions the Brethren often demanded proof from Scripture and appealed to Scripture; e. g., pp. 43 a, 54 b, 56 b, 74 a, 80 b, 83 a, 83 b, 92 a, 98 b, 130 a, 145 a.

68 *Acta Des gesprächs,* fol. 172.

69 *Ibid.,* fol. 149.

70 *Ibid.,* fol. 153. For further appeals to Scripture and demands to abide by Scripture Cf. fol. 21, 30, 49, 61, 66, 132, 143, 147, 155, 156, 173, 176, 178, 189, 204, 213, 217, 221, 223, 236, 272, 274, 277, 283, 290, 301.

The following is taken from a resolution passed by a conference of the Swiss Brethren which was held at Strasburg in 1555:

> Since it is not only perilous but culpable to add to or take from the Word (Deut. 4:2; Prov. 30:6; Rev. 22:18, 19), we would bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ (II Cor. 10:5) and confess Him in strict accordance to Scripture.[71]

The contemporary chronicler Sebastian Franck, who held a "spiritualizing" view in regard to the authority of Scripture, states that "there arose from the letter of Scripture, separate from the state churches, a new sect which was called Anabaptists . . . . By their good appearance and *the letter of Scripture, to which they strictly adhered,* they drew to themselves many thousand God-fearing hearts who had a zeal for God."[72] Caspar Schwenckfeld, in 1530, also expressed the opinion that they placed undue emphasis on the letter of Scripture.[73]

The quotations from Conrad Grebel's letter to Thomas Münzer in regard to the authority of Scripture must be taken in their setting to get their full intent. This letter was written previous to the organization of the first congregation of the Swiss Brethren. Münzer was at that time a pastor in the national church and had undertaken various reforms in his parish at Allstädt in Saxony. From the Scriptural viewpoint his reforms were obviously inadequate. He was still drawing his salary as a priest and had retained various Roman Catholic rites and usages. Furthermore, as said above, he believed that new revelations are needed. The purpose of Grebel's letter was to meet and repudiate these points. He shows that it is not sufficient to hold in theory that the Scriptures

---

[71] *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* vol. VII, The Hague, 1910, p. 228; ten Cate, B., *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Groningen, Overijssel en Oost-Friesland,* vol. I, Leeuwarden, 1842, p. 256. The translation of this passage given in Brons, A., *Ursprung, Entwicklung und Schicksale der Taufgesinnten,* dritte Auflage, Emden, 1912, is faulty. On Menno's position regarding the authority of Scripture cf. Horsch, J., *Menno Simons, His Life, Labors and Teachings,* Scottdale, 1916, pp. 224-226.

[72] Franck, S., *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschichtbibel,* 1531, fol. 440 b.

[73] *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum,* vol. III, Leipzig, 1913, p. 832 f. The "Anabaptist" preacher Leonhard Schiemer, formerly a priest, who was executed on January 14, 1528, at Rothenburg in the Tyrol, proposed to the judges who condemned him to death: Since they regarded his doctrine and faith heretical, they should arrange for learned persons, doctors, priests and monks, to discuss the disputed points with him on Scriptural grounds. He suggested further both orally and in writing: If they could show from Scripture that he was in error, and as often as any one of the learned could do this and show that his teaching was wrong and was not the doctrine of Scripture, the executioner should sever one of his limbs from his body, and when deprived of his limbs, tear out the ribs from his body until he expired. *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder,* p. 43 f; Van Braght, *Bloody Theatre,* p. 409.

are God's Word and the final authority, but it is necessary to discard the unscriptural doctrines and usages. He admonished him to lay down his office[74] and "go forward according to the Word and organize a true Christian church."[75] These admonitions were not heeded by Münzer. The plea for a whole-hearted recognition of the authority of Scripture, not merely in theory but in actual practice, is made throughout this letter of Grebel.

The Brethren defended the principle that all Christian doctrines, principles and rites or ceremonies are taught in Scripture, and anything that is not founded on Scripture is unacceptable. The Roman Catholic Church had many doctrines and rites which could not be countenanced from the viewpoint of Scripture teaching. The fathers of the Mennonite Church believed that of such things nothing should be accepted that is not clearly mentioned and approved in Scripture. This was precisely Zwingli's former position also, as is abundantly proved by his earlier writings.[76] The Brethren pointed out that Zwingli and his co-workers failed to adhere to their former teaching on this point. Conrad Grebel wrote in December, 1524, to the Council of Zurich:

> In the discussions which the ministers [of the state church] had with us, they failed to follow your instructions, namely that Scripture must be allowed to speak and nothing must be added

---

74 *Gedenkschrift,* p. 94.

75 *Ibid.,* p. 95.

76 Of this there is abundant evidence. E. g., in the disputation held on January 29, 1523, Zwingli addressed his opponent, the General Vicar Johann Fabri, of Constance: "Therefore, vicar, I desire that you show us where it is written in divine Scripture concerning the invocation of the saints and the intercession of the mother of God. This we wish to hear. Answer to the point." "Show us only this, where in the biblical books which were mentioned by you it is written about the intercession and invocation of the [departed] saints. This I desire to be told of you, and I ask you for the sake of Christian love to do this with clear, pure, plain divine Scripture.—Show us the chapter and give answer in simple, clear words. Say: there and there it is written, and we shall find the place and see whether it is correct." "I say, you should prove from Scripture that the mass is a sacrifice." "Answer and defend your opinion with clear Scripture. Say: here it is written." (Jackson, *Selected Works,* p. 67 f). In a book published somewhat later Zwingli wrote: "Yes, indeed, the word of God must settle this matter. You say, for example, that the mass is a sacrifice. This you must prove by the word of God. See now, you stand like a goat before the butcher. Now you begin to cry out: The [church] fathers held the mass to be such. I am not talking of fathers nor of mothers; it must be decided from the word of God." (*Zwinglis Werke,* vol. II, Leipsig, 1908, p. 449). Urban Heberle says: "Zwingli had serious difficulty in defending his position [in his conflict with the Brethren], for he himself had upheld the principle of the sole authority of Scripture in the same radical manner in which it was now applied by his opponents, and it could scarcely be questioned that even the application which they made of this principle in particular respects was originally his own." (*Die Anfänge des Anabaptismus in der Schweiz,* Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, vol. III, Stuttgart, 1858, p. 279 f).

> to or taken from it. This instruction was not carried out. They have indeed presented their opinion but have not established it by the Scriptures . . . . They demand from us proof from Scripture [that their own position is unorthodox], while it is in their place to furnish proof that what they teach is the truth.[77]

In his *Book on Baptism* Zwingli states his agreement with the Brethren as concerns the principle that all doctrine must be founded on Scripture. He asserts, however, that they are going too far when they say that in the question of rites, or "outward things," such as baptism, the same test should be applied.[78] In the same book he says that the Brethren criticized him severely for renouncing his former view, that not only the doctrines and principles but also the rites and ceremonies of the church must be founded on Scripture. He says: "Here they [the Brethren] cry murder over me and say, 'Against the Roman Catholic theologians you have always asserted that whatever has no ground in God's Word is unacceptable,' and now you say, 'There is much that is not written in God's Word and is nevertheless in accordance with His will!' "[79]

---

[77] Cf. note 31.

[78] *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, p. 302. Martin Luther, as well as Zwingli, in the first period of his labors as a reformer of the church, taught that only what is founded on Scripture can be recognized as acceptable. In Wartburg Castle he wrote in November, 1522: "Whatever is ordered [in the church] without God's Word, is not ordered of the true church but of the synagogue of Satan. — Let the papists prove their priesthood from Scripture, or they must confess that these things are nothing but dissimulations of Satan and condemned idols." (*Luthers Werke,* Erlangen edition, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 41 f.) Within a few weeks after he had written this he was called upon to decide certain important issues which concerned partly the relation between church and state. He wrote under the date of January 13, 1523, a letter to Melanchthon in which he defended the opinion that Scripture authority is not necessarily required for the teaching and practice of the church. He fell back to the position of the Roman Catholic Church and asserted that "whatever is not contrary to Scripture is for Scripture and Scripture is for it." (Enders, E. L., *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel,* vol. III, p. 276). In his little book *On Anabaptism* he says: "If anything which has been in use for a long time is to be changed, it should and must be proved to be contrary to God's Word." (*Luthers Werke,* Weimar edition, vol. XXVI, p. 155). The question, What is to be considered contrary to Scripture? he answered to the effect that only those things should be so considered which are expressly forbidden. He took the position that images, altars, priestly garments, the use of the word mass, etc. are permissible because they are not forbidden. (*Luthers Werke,* Erlangen, vol. XXIX, p. 210. Cf. Horsch, J., *Infant Baptism, Its Origin Among Protestants and the Arguments Advanced for and Against it,* Scottdale, Pa., 1917, pp. 29-38.

[79] *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, p. 269.

Heberle, an impartial Protestant historian, gives the following noteworthy testimony on this point:

> First of all we must recognize the outstanding fact that Grebel and his followers held the Scriptures in the highest regard in both oral testimony and actual practice. Never do they appeal to direct divine revelations; never do they speak of Scripture as the dead letter in contrast to new revelations and to the living divine voice. What they want is the Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, and nothing but the Scriptures . . . . Hence Grebel never complains that the opposite party [the leading theologians of the national church] emphasize too much the need of following the letter of Scripture but, on the contrary, his criticism is that they take this matter too lightly.[80]

Dr. Paul Burckhardt, a historian of the Reformed Church, says of the Brethren:

> They agreed with the leading reformers in recognizing the Scriptures alone as the norm. In the debates they would not consider any arguments except those from Scripture. Whatever was not commanded in Scripture, as concerns matters of faith, they believed to be forbidden.[81]

These and other authors state, as we have seen, that the Swiss Brethren never spoke of Scripture lightly as the dead letter in contrast to new revelations and to the living divine voice, after the manner of Thomas Münzer, Sebastian Franck, Hans Denck and others. Now the statement that the theologians of the state church never charged the Brethren with disregarding the letter of Scripture is correct but does not tell the whole truth. The fact is that, on the contrary, as will directly be shown, in the opinion of the state church leaders the Brethren overemphasized the letter of Scripture.

This opinion of the leaders of the state church is significant. Zwingli, in his controversy with the Roman Catholics, had strenuously insisted, as intimated above, that whatever is not expressed

---

80 *Die Anfänge des Anabaptismus,* p. 276. Heberle's important statement that the Brethren never appealed to direct divine revelation, while indeed true to fact, was contradicted, as said above, by the earlier antagonists of the Brethren and by many modern writers who hold the contrary view on what they think to be good authority. John Calvin, in his *Short Instruction,* made the same charge. He says concerning the seven articles of Schlatt: "Let us come nowe unto the fyrst Article of the seuen whyche are contayned in thys fayre forked resolution, whyche they hold for a reuelation from heauen." (Sig. A IV v). This assertion is, needless to say, without foundation.

81 Burckhardt, P., *Die Basler Täufer, Ein Beitrag zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte,* Basel, 1898, p. 112. Alfred Hegler says: "It is significant how strongly the authority of the Scriptures, not of the Spirit, is emphasized in the hymns of the Anabaptists." (*Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck,* Freiburg i. Br., 1892, p. 278).

by the letter of Scripture is unacceptable. Now he asserted that the Brethren followed the letter too closely at the expense of love and unity. He was of the opinion that love should cause them to overlook and ignore the existing points of difference on which he had formerly agreed with them. Did he realize that he would have thought it strange if his Roman Catholic opponents had approached him with such a proposition, namely, that for the sake of love and unity he should cease his testimony against the errors of Romanism?

(To be continued)

THE BACKGROUND AND CAUSES OF THE FLIGHT OF THE MENNONITES FROM RUSSIA IN 1929

Benjamin H. Unruh

The question of the emigration of the Mennonites out of Russia was already an important question in the minds of a number of men before the outbreak of the World War. W. P. Neufeld of Halbstadt, Russia, later of Reedley, Calif., suddenly left Russia a few years before the beginning of the War and justified his step in a detailed discussion in his farewell sermon. One of my friends whose vision and intuition I have always valued had already arrived at the conviction some time before the Japanese war that the Mennonites would have to leave Russia. Apparently the revolution which shook the Russian Empire in 1905-1907 made him sense further, more powerful crises in the offing. I remember also that on one Sunday morning before 1914 a simple farmer visited me and spoke to me in a somewhat disturbed state of mind as though oppressed by inner visions, saying that it was high time to leave Russia.

But the emigration first became a question of vital importance in the time of the World War and after.

The great physical and moral distress in which the German colonists in general and the Mennonites in particular found themselves during this time was the chief reason for this. The prohibition of the German language, of German preaching, the closing of the German press, of German clubs, the closing or russification of German schools and other centers of German culture, the evacuations, deportations and arrests, and the confusion and terror of the civil war, the famine and the plagues, the tribulations of all sorts, and many-sided death and ruin—that has been since 1914 the fate of the German colonist in Russia. It is easy to understand that this tragic situation compelled the colonists to re-examine their own situation and that it above everything fed the desire to emigrate.

As far as it is possible at the present time to judge the motives for the emigration at all, for we are really too near to the events to have a satisfactory understanding of their course, I wish to at-

tempt in the brief space at my disposal to give first a brief survey of the remoter causes for the desire to emigrate, since the flight of masses of the Mennonites out of the Soviet Union in the autumn of 1929 can be understood only in the light of this background. The more immediate causes of this flight however, political as well as religious, will form the major part of my discussion.

I

The Remote Political and Economic Background

The movement for emigration is the result of a bitter disappointment which the German colonists in Russia are experiencing as the result of the chasm between "once and now." Again and again one reads discussions and comments on this theme in letters and articles, by the colonists themselves, comments by colonists with quite different historical points of view. In addition to this disappointment, there was the feeling of resignation which however, especially in the more sturdy Mennonite circles, was displaced by a double movement, first in the direction of the organization of new colonies in Russia and second in the direction of emigration over-seas. The Mennonite "soul", as well as the "soul" of the German colonist in Russia, in general, is still much too young to fall prey to complete resignation. Today, it is true, the depression among these people is quite complete. Today our churches are learning to live in blind faith. Today they constitute a church "under the cross", which does not "gird itself", but "is being girded."

The distress in which the colonists found themselves faced them with the question, "to be, or not to be". It was a triple question of existence,— economical, national, and religio-ethical.

The economic decline began with the outbreak of the war and has continued into decay and ruin. The large estates in the colonies were hit first by the confiscation law of the year 1915. At that time the owners were deported and Russian managers placed on the estates, who for the most part understood little or nothing of agriculture, who squandered the invested capital, and under whose managership the livestock on the estates rapidly decreased as the result of unwise measures, and whose management of the land was so bad that the production of grain suffered exceedingly. The former owners moved as poor people into the villages, where they struggled for their existence in the most difficult work. In Russia for such persons there was naturally no possibility of further existence. For them the sole avenue of escape lay in emigra-

tion. Even today, although they have been driven from their property for years, and robbed of all that they had, they are despised and helpless in the midst of the land, without legal rights, the prey of the caprice of the local officials. As for the peasant, especially in those times when the emigration movement began, he was completely hamstrung. The question of the division of the land remained unsettled. What was called revolutionary legislation has remained uncertain, partial, and often only a dead letter. Normally the peasant had the right to the usufruct of the land which remained in his possession, and therefore the right to operate independently the small farm which he called his own. However during the civil war the stock was so destroyed by ruthless requisitions that plowing, sowing, and threshing were almost an impossibility during the first years of the Revolution. For instance, often not a single team of really usable draft animals was left on a farm. Earlier, every Mennonite farmer had from eight to ten strong work horses; and six to ten cattle, but now the stables were empty. No wonder that the farmer became apathetic. The machinery on the farm soon wore out because of the lack of repair shops which made repairs impossible. Often the machinery had to be sold at beggarly prices in order to raise money to pay taxes. New purchases were not to be thought of. And just as there was a lack in live stock and machinery, so there was a lack of seed grain. The drought even destroyed what had been with great difficulty sowed in the spring. Bread was lacking, clothing was lacking, fuel was lacking,—in other words, there was a catastrophic economic decline, a decay in all phases of the economic life of the colonies. Only the breeding of sheep improved, a symbol of a decline in agriculture to the pastoral state.

The local officials systematically furthered the destruction of the economic life, particularly by means of foolishly high taxes in the form of payments in kind, which were collected with unexampled severity. The last kernel had to be swept together on the floor and handed over; the last hog, the last cow, and the last chicken were confiscated. The soldiers hunted through the houses, arrests were made, and executions were the normal accompaniment of all those anarchistic economic measures, especially in the fall of 1921. In almost every village more taxes were demanded than the entire harvest, so that the sale of the equipment on the farm in order to pay taxes was unavoidable. With bleeding hearts, the farmers followed this course so long that resignation and apathy mastered them.

In the villages the so-called "committees of the landless," that is, organizations of the so-called "beggar-proletariat", were set up which were composed almost exclusively of foreign and non-resident elements in the village. The endless chicanery of these committees contributed greatly to making the peasant-farmer feel that he was being torn loose from his own home. All labor seemed to be in vain, because the fruits of it were seized by covetous hands. With the peasant-farmer especially the sense of possession is very strongly marked and in a state where the forms of ownership had taken on such a chaotic character, he was naturally made to feel as though he was living in a vacuum. All desire for action disappeared.

The uncertain economic situation made the farmers however look for a new home. Not only the families who had been already robbed of their property, that is the owners of large estates as well as the refugees from the daughter colonies, and also not only those who had lost their spiritual and moral hold on things, were among those who thought of emigration. Even the modest farmer, with his small farm still in his own actual possession, was almost ready to leave. The situation of the refugees who had streamed back into the mother colony from the daughter colonies during the times of anarchy and famine was beyond description. Deprived of all the means of earning a living, homeless, without the privilege of working, they were compelled to live from direct charity relief, which however no one could give them, neither the churches nor the communities, nor the government. If the generous hand of the American and Dutch Mennonite brethren had not been stretched out to them to bring bread to those who were starving, in the years 1921-1923, ten thousands of these poor people would have perished in their misery. That these farmer-peasants who had been ruined had to emigrate was not denied, even by the government. For this reason the government granted in April of 1922 permission to this group to emigrate. But this was only a drop of water on a hot stone. In a letter of that time someone wrote, "the whole Mennonite population of Russia is ready to travel." On the day before Christmas even in 1921 the chairman of the Ukrainian Mennonite Economic Union wrote, "Actually a chasm has opened up among us here so quickly and in part so unexpectedly, so endlessly deep and broad, that the great mass of the Russian people is sinking in it and our people are sinking likewise." B. B. Janz had described the situation in petitions which were handed to the Ukrainian government. Naturally what could be reported in official documents had to be expressed "wisely and moderately."

The reality however was much more bitter. "The situation is so sad, so hopeless, we are traveling into the deep night of death so rapidly that it has happened before we actually realized it. The last bit of bread is being eaten and everywhere there are those who have no bread."

No one need wonder that a Mennonite Bishop wrote to me already on July 4, 1921: "For some time, to use an expression out of the history of Israel, we have had to make bricks and build cities, and now they have taken away from us the straw and are compelling us to gather the stubble. . . .In this way we are being brought more and more to the decision to leave Egypt and seek another home, even though we may not be able to take anything with us."

In addition to the economic-cultural distress, there came the political and national distress. Since the middle of the previous century an increasingly significant tendency toward animosity against the German colonists was making itself felt in Russian government circles, and even in social circles. Long series of unjust, unprovable accusations were made against the colonists. They were told for instance that they had not fulfilled "their duty as citizens." But of such duties nothing had been said when they were invited to immigrate into Russia in 1783 and after, for the absolutistic Russian state knew nothing of duties of "citizenship." It knew only "subjects," not "citizens." The citizens were only objects of government and not subjects of government. Another charge was that the colonists had not improved the level of culture of the Russian peasants. But was not the lack of improvement in the culture of the Russian peasants due to the system of serfdom, that system of complete slavery which made impossible any cultural development? The colonists were told that they had not assimilated themselves to the Russian people, but the government itself and the orthodox church had not desired this. Again, the colonists had enjoyed unusual privileges, they were told. But without these privileges, Russia as a cultureless, backward country would never have received these foreign settlers within her borders. And what was promised them was really nothing less than the bare minimum of existence. And even the exemption from military service was fully made up for by the service in the state forests, which cost the state almost nothing and was of much value.

All these accusations, of course, came from an increasingly narrow chauvinism. Furthermore, the Russian government did not wish to permit the Russian Mennonites to leave in the 1870's when they wanted to emigrate to America with families and prop-

erty on account of the threatened compulsion for military service. The government knew what it was doing when it sent General Totleben into the South, who was very popular and was able to prevent a total emigration of the Mennonites.

The economic significance of the German, and particularly of the Mennonite colonization cannot be over-estimated. Through the colonization of the newly acquired territories on the edge of the Russian empire in the south, acquired from the Ottoman Empire by conquests, these new lands were converted into secure possessions of the state. Through this colonization alone the government succeeded in making the resource of the newly conquered territories quickly available in areas that would otherwise have remained undeveloped for a long time.

A particular cultural task had not been expected of the colonists, but what was laid upon them in this respect they accomplished in an unusual measure, as was recognized by governmental authorities.* Two things were expected of the colonists: They were to be of benefit in the newly settled territory and to the state in general by building up their own culture (civilization) and second through their example they were to stimulate cultural progress among their Russian neighbors. Both aims were actually realized. One need only compare a Russian village in the neighborhood of a German colony with a village which lies farther away. As the colonies spread, naturally their cultural influence was extended. The Russian farm laborers learned very much technically and as to methods from the German farms and took their newly acquired knowledge back into their villages. They also accustomed themselves to an orderly way of living and learned to appreciate industry and reliability. The introduction of the system of fallow land is one of the services of the German colonists. Among the colonists the production of seed, grain, and the breeding of cattle, as well as the smaller industries on the farm, contributed very much to raise the economic level of the Russian villages.

In addition to the indirect influences of the German colonists on their Russian neighbors, attempts were made to influence Russian conditions directly. Johann Cornies introduced practical agricultural courses for Russian and Nogaian boys and girls. The attendance was large. It is to be regretted that little more was done in this direction. Here there is, without doubt, a sin of omission,

* See the letter of Minister Kissilev to Johann Cornies in 1841.

which however can easily be understood in view of the fear of the colonists, that they would be accused of political, nationalistic, and religious propaganda. There are in Taurien two Russian villages which were organized by pupils of Johann Cornies according to the Mennonite pattern. Under the influence of the Mennonites, the remnants of the primitive Nogaians gave up their nomadic life. The colonists were also the best tax payers and created out of their own means a large number of charitable institutions which were also accessible to the Russian population. This is especially true of the hospitals with their excellent staffs of physicians.

For this reason the colonists were naturally bitterly disappointed to be suddenly accused of being undesirable intruders and even to be branded as traitors of the fatherland. A few years ago an intelligent colonist expressed this feeling in the following words: "Russia has proved herself to be an evil stepmother who desires to destroy her step-children in order to secure their inheritance for her legitimate children. We have no longer a fatherland . . ." These words show how deeply the insult burned in the souls of the colonists.

On the other hand in the time of the War and after the War the colonists experienced how bad conditions can become when a country has lost a stable social order and when the citizens are no longer governed by respect for the law. In post-Revolutionary Russia there was lacking the consciousness that the law was the expression of the common will of the entire nation, which all therefore ought to follow. The decrees of the authorities were contradictory and still are contradictory and often contradict the most elemental sense of justice. In addition, there was the unfaithfulness and corruption of the officials and the lack of a sense of duty among the officers of the state, a situation to which many colonists gradually adjusted themselves without noticing the change. As a consequence, some of them, although they did not take bribes, began to give "gifts" in order to attain their rights. They purchased their rights and this demoralized them. They lost thereby their sense of "right;" "right" often came to be "wrong" and vice versa.

In addition to the national antipathy between the Russians and the German colonists, there came the social antipathy. On the one side it was the Russian jealousy; on the other side the excessive self-evaluation of the colonists. The Russians looked upon the colonists as intruders, and the latter saw in the Russians often a dangerous criminal type, although this may be formulating the antithe-

sis in an extreme form. For a long time the antipathy remained dormant, but during the War it broke out with irresistible force.

In view of the above facts and causes a further national political-civil existence for the German colonists in Russia seemed very dubious. And as a result the demand arose for emigration, for a total emigration of the Mennonite group.

But the greatest danger of all appeared more and more to be the threat to the religious and social life of the group. Even the old czaristic government had begun to interfere in the school and church life of the colonists, though on the whole the churches enjoyed complete religious liberty. To-day in Soviet Russia this has become much worse. More about this later on.

The emigration movement (whose detailed history however is not to be related here) finally set in in 1923. About the same time however a certain easing of the situation became noticeable in the colonies, due to the new economic policy (NEP) which had been introduced by Lenin, whereby the farmers, the peasants, were granted more liberty of action. In this period the Mennonite economic organizations such as the All-Russian Mennonite Agricultural Union, achieved extraordinary success, especially in the task of producing seed-grain, and improving stock-breeding, achievements which were recognized to the full by the authorities. However, beginning with the year 1926, there came a turn in the policy and attitude of the government, a regression to the older terroristic policy, which has now reached its height. The flight of the colonists out of Russia in 1929 was nothing less than a symptom of this economic and religious situation.

II

The Immediate Political Background of the Flight

There are two basic tendencies in the policy of the Soviet government which are mutually exclusive and which are based upon two distinct objectives. The one tendency and task is the struggle to bring about the world revolution. The hope is to win throughout the entire world a victory for the communistic ideology, and that by means of force. To attain this goal, time, labor, and immense amounts of money are sacrificed. The second tendency and task is the reconstruction of Russia, which has been ruined by civil war and famine. However, in spite of all the heroic endeavors of the present rulers of Russia, it seems impossible to successfully complete this reconstruction. The struggle for the world revolution constantly hinders and obstructs this reconstruction. A delusion ob-

scures the reality and destroys the effect of the good elements which are without doubt contained in the great program. The conflict between the two tendencies and tasks goes through everything which the Soviet government attempts, speaks, and does. It is the contradiction between a Utopian ideal and a practical political and economic task of the present hour. The fanaticism of the communistic movement learns nothing, and for that reason the final outcome is certain to be a catastrophe. In the call for a halt which Stalin issued last spring we can hear the distant thunder of the approaching crash. Meanwhile the most intense activity is concentrated upon the prosecution of the double program.

All the conflict, contradiction, and dishonesty of the Soviet policy is the result of this basic double program. For instance, Stalin, so it is said, pays no attention at all to the judgment of foreign nations. But the same Stalin seeks to cover up with all the possible maneuvers of the clever politician what actually is taking place in Russia. In the long run, however, this attempt is bound to fail and it was just the flight of six thousand Mennonite and other farmers out of Russia which tore open the eyes of the outside world to what was actually going on behind the artificially erected scenes on the Soviet stage. That is the great political significance of this remarkable flight. Altogether unpolitical persons, that is, these simple farmers, suddenly acquired an extraordinary political significance without having desired or having known it. That is the reason for the rage of the authorities in Russia at these simple folk. That is the reason for the terrible sufferings of those who had to remain behind. They are bearing the consequences of the flight, which meant a great international discrediting for the Kremlin.

The Russian Revolution has passed through various phases and has now come into its decisive phase, if all signs do not fail us. This is also the opinion of the Bolsheviki themselves. Bolshevism is at the present time experiencing something of a "second youth." A short time ago it seemed to have already lost its original dynamic quality and many foreign observers were beginning to speak about an evolution, a gradual modification of Russian communism in the direction of capitalistic economics and democratic political principles. But they failed to realize that Bolshevism is a religion, an ecstatic religion, which is not ready to disavow itself. Like the great world religions it claims absolute validity. This demonic religion is experiencing to-day a revival. Reports, resolutions, decisions by congresses, appeals in the newspapers and in the meetings, court decisions, accusations, and last but not least, the deporta-

tions with a purpose of destroying an entire stratum of the peasants, all this breathes the hot breath of the springtime of revolution, a second springtime.

The chief goal of all Bolshevist struggle is the construction of the great socialistic society. Stalin's "five-year plan" is a program to create the communistic state. This program is Stalin's dogma, his *regula fidei,* his bishop's staff, his compass, according to which he is steering the ship of state to its distant harbor.

But the peasant is the last wall against which Bolshevism strikes in the struggle to attain its goal. If it can overthrow this wall, then it has won the victory. If it succeeds in socializing agriculture and industrializing it, if it succeeds in converting the peasant farmer into a factory worker, in transforming the endless agricultural territories of Russia into a gigantic grain factory, if it succeeds in dissolving the peasant family and therefore attacking religion in its most vulnerable point, then the whole communistic dream will become a reality. If this all succeeds, then the battle of communism is won forever.

It is a fact that the peasant population of Russia was what put Bolshevism in the saddle. The land-hungry peasants represented in 1917 a still unexpressed, unused revolutionary factor. For that reason Lenin could harness them to his revolutionary chariot. On the other hand, however, it is just the peasants who to-day represent the greatest hindrance to the realization of socialism in as much as the peasant spirit of independent endeavor and individual economics (even in Russia, which is the classic land of peasant village agriculture) resists the program of communism. It is false to hastily ascribe to the Russian peasant an agrarian-communistic fundamental character. The Russian peasant was anxious to have the land of the wealthy land-owner, but he wanted to have it as his own possession and use it himself. And even the Soviet peasant has his heart set on a legal title to his land.

The peasants are the real bug-bear of Bolshevism. The peasant class will determine the fate of Bolshevism in the end. The peasants will speak the last word in Russia. The history of the Russian revolutions is throughout one endless bitter struggle with the peasants.

The first period of Bolshevism is usually called, according to Lenin, the period of "war communism," because in that period everything was taken away from the peasants to feed the army and the cities. It was the period of expropriation, of forced labor, of rationing, of the destruction of all private economic activity, of the

militarization of labor and life. But this attempt of the city to subjugate the country ended in 1921 with the victory of the country, of the peasant. The city capitulated to the village. "War communism" had led to a stoppage of production, to secret trading, to inflation, and above all, to sabotage by the peasants, to the reduction of the area under cultivation and consequently to famine. The outcome was a complete fiasco which Lenin himself admitted in the spring of 1921 with perfect candor. The chief hindrance to the realization of communism had turned out to be the peasants. Lenin himself gave a temperamental funeral oration at the grave of "war communism." "War communism" had died a natural death, because where there is nothing to be had, there even the commissar loses his power. According to official figures in 1918-19 the demand for bread on the part of the population could be met only to the amount of forty per cent and the demand for potatoes in the city only to twenty to twenty-five per cent. Textile goods were confiscated by the army to one hundred per cent. The civil population had to go without; this produced a keen dissatisfaction, since no state dare reckon with a "disinterested love" on the part of its citizens.

As a result of this fiasco a complete change of front was necessary in the realm of the economic policy, and so the second period of Bolshevism was ushered in, the period of the "new economic policy," which Lenin however, in order to satisfy communistic orthodoxy, represented as a mere breathing space, simply a moratorium for capitalism. The fighting front was merely withdrawn a few kilometers in order to be pushed forward so much more energetically later on.

The new economic policy put an end to confiscations and substituted therefore a regular tax in money or naturalia. There was a constant shifting from tax in money to tax in naturalia, according to the business cycle, in order to obtain from the labor of the village the utmost possible for the national treasury. Under a new name, therefore, the old methods of confiscation after all were continued, although in somewhat more moderate form. Agriculture and small industry, as well as small trade, could live in the time of the NEP and even prospered to some extent. However the foreign visitors in Soviet Russia in the years 1923-27 who brought home favorable reports about the economic situation, overlooked the fact that this relative revival took place not on the basis of the original Bolshevist program, but on the basis of the deviations from this program

in the direction of a coöperative private business, with its play of free forces.

The death of Lenin, as even his sickness already, brought a tremendous problem to the Communist Party. With the passing of its leader, the party ceased to be an entity cast out of one mould. The tower was cracked. Above all, the NEP became the object of passionate debate for the communists saw in it the beginning of treason to communism.

As has been suggested, it is true that the NEP really was something which lay in the shadow of the communistic creed. What Lenin did was to take economic freedom out for a walk, but he compelled it constantly to show a police permit for itself and to return constantly behind the bars. The NEP-man remained a marked man, one constantly threatened by the authorities. Free trade was more and more restrained under the competition of the coöperatives toward the end of the NEP period. The animosity against the Russian village constantly increased, and raids on rebelling peasants became more frequent. The basic economic conflict between the communistic organization and the people became constantly more evident. Earlier or later it would have to lead to a new open struggle between the Kremlin and the Russian villages.

This open struggle or state of war has now come with the new radical agrarian policy of Stalin, which represents the basis for the materialistic cultural policy of the Soviet Union. To Stalin, the machine is God. The high point in the idolatry of Stalin is the worship of the tractor. The subject of this religion is the "Massenmensch", mass humanity. Just as the difference between city and country is to be wiped out, just as the farmer is to become an industrial laborer, just so all individual differences are to be suppressed in Russia. There are to be no personalities anymore, only atoms and groups of atoms, reactions of the elements, a great physical, chemical process, without soul, without God, without eternity, without conscience and responsibility.

The peasants must be "proletarianized" and since the upper stratum of the peasants, the "Kulaks", who represent the cream on the skim milk, stand in the way of this proletarianizing, therefore the destruction of the "Kulak" class must be undertaken, without hesitation, systematically, thoroughly. The liquidation of the upper peasants stratum and the communization of the poorer peasants are the stages which will lead to the communistic paradise. Marxistic theory is severest in its application to the peasant class. What can be converted of the peasants to Marxian theory is to be

made "proletariat." Everything else is reckoned as "Kulak" and must be annihilated.

Since 1927 business has come more and more under the power of politics. The breathing space was ended which Lenin had announced. The trench war in the economic policy was transformed again into a war movement. The NEP-men were deported by wagon loads to the north. A flood of communistic radicalism was poured out over the village. The third period of the revolution began, that of the consistent socialism. The "five-year plan" is nothing less than a program, a budget for five years, to accomplish this, a plan which includes all branches and functions of the entire economic organism of the Soviet Union. After the period of reconstruction of the old economic system, a period of construction of the new economic system is to set in. In five years the national wealth is to be doubled, which is to accompany an increase in production, a decline in prices, and a rise in the wage level to about double that of peace time. The most important requirement of the five-year plan however is the socialization of agriculture. This is to take place in stages, namely, first the "coöperative" or common cultivation of the soil, then the "artel", and finally the "commune." In the coöperative, the comrades only combine their land and divide the profit proportionally to what each one puts in and what each one contributes in the way of labor. The "artel" goes further and extends the communism to the entire business, and the year's profit is divided. The farmers still live and consume each for himself. In the commune, however, not only production, but also consumption is collectivized, as is also the life in general.

It is easy to understand that the peasant will not accept all this without opposition and it is understandable that the state must engage in a sharp struggle against the resisting peasants, especially against the superior farmer in whom it sees the carrier of a new capitalistic development and the nucleus of reactionary political action.

The membership of the party believes thoroughly in the possibility of carrying through this plan. The difficulties which are met are simply viewed as the crises of growth. In order to arouse the energy of the masses for the program of socialization, regular competitive contests in economic activities are carried on. One district challenges the other and strives to put it "in the shade". For instance, in the last year Siberia entered into a contract with north Caucasus for a contest in agricultural production.

III.

1929

In July, 1929, a decree appeared which was directed against the upper stratum of peasant-farmers. The village councils were allowed to punish comrades in the village who resisted payment of the grain tax *with money fines,* the fine being permitted to range up to five times what was originally due in grain. The councils were also authorized, in case it was necessary, to sell the property of the guilty person at auction. In the Ukraine, auctions, confiscations, and deportations took place in large numbers as early as June and July. The same took place in Siberia. The government was returning apparently to communism, and that in much sharper form. Naturally of course impossible grain taxes were imposed on the "Kulaks" in order to furnish a legal pretext for action.

By these measures, the "poor" peasants in the village now were enabled to destroy the "Kulak" economically. They could decide that this or that "Kulak" was to be deported, and it took place. The letters of the colonists, which have been published chiefly in the Mennonite press in America, disclose a terrible picture of these deportations. The "party" leaders in Moscow thus shove the whole responsibility upon the local village authorities. With this policy, they kill two birds with one stone. In the first place the state secures in this "proper" manner the grain of the "Kulaks" and thus overcomes at least for a few months the grain crisis, and second it prepares the village for socialization.

We know how rapidly the socialization has been taking place. The reasons for this are quite clear. The "communists" in the village are furnished with good seed grain and receive high prices for their grain. In addition industries are set up in the communes, schools, hospitals, to which only "communists" have access. The peasant has to join the commune to avoid ruin. And still the close confinement in the communes is a heavy burden for most of the peasants. Here he loses in the end his independence, for here any sort of individual living becomes impossible.

And so one can understand why Stalin had to blow a bugle for retreat in the middle of March of 1929, when the undigested mass of "communized" peasants threatened to become dangerous. According to recent report, many of the communes soon went to pieces again.

But Stalin took his revenge on the "Kulaks." He deported them by the thousands to the north or to Siberia, where they must

perish in their misery, especially the children. But this policy on the part of Stalin apparently has aroused great dissatisfaction in the entire country and even in the party. One accordingly awaits the outcome of this tremendous struggle with great interest.

The political background of the flight of the peasants out of the Soviet Union is now quite clear. The flight was a despairing attempt to escape destruction. It is not accidental that most of the fleeing colonists came out of Siberia where the harvest in the preceding year had been quite small. Above everything else, however, especially for the Mennonites the most powerful factor in promoting the emigration was the fear of the "commune of the godless." Alongside of the political reasons, the religious reasons were decisive in bringing about the flight.

(*To be continued*)

THE MENNONITE COLONY IN TURKESTAN

JOHANNES JANZEN

I

The Cause for the Foundation of the Colony

Between the years 1874 and 1880 there was a large emigration of Mennonites from south Russia (the Ukraine), to the United States of America. This movement was caused by the proclamation of universal military service in Russia which, as is well known, was contrary to the faith of the Mennonite Church. It is true that the Mennonites were permitted to engage in service in the state forests as a substitute for military service. However, the emigrants who went to North America wanted to have their sons free of all service to the state and for this reason felt obliged to leave Russia. Among those who wanted to free their sons from service to the state at all costs were some who were convinced from the study of the Scriptures that freedom was to be found in the East and not in the West. According to their understanding, the anti-Christ, whose coming according to all appearances was near at hand, was to arise in the West and enter upon his devastating career there. They, therefore, thought to accomplish two objectives in going to the East, namely, freedom from state service for their sons, and at the same time attainment of a place of refuge for the Church from the anti-Christ. After they had sought in vain for a place for colonization in the Caucasus, some of them went to Leningrad, then called St. Petersburg, to lay their wishes before the government. As it happened, the governor-general of Turkestan, von Kauffman, was at that time visiting the Czar and learned of the delegation of Mennonites. He invited them to come to Turkestan, where they would be permitted fifteen years of complete freedom from all state service. As a result of this interview, two brethren were sent to Turkestan to investigate the land and the people there and to discover what the possibilities of making a living in that region were, and at the same time to explore the best route to that far-off country.

In August, 1880, our fathers set out from the villages in the Molotschna upon the long journey to Tashkend, their first objective. I will refrain from describing this journey and refer for more detailed account to the book, *Unser Auszug nach Mittelasien,* by

Franz Bartsch. However, I wish to point out in this connection that the originator of this movement to Turkestan is not the Claas Epp who appears in this book as the hero of the entire affair. On the contrary, Epp joined the movement in the Molotschna after it had arisen, and attempted to set himself up as leader. I shall explain later how it came about and why our fathers ultimately separated from him and broke off all relationships.

In the beginning of December of the same year, 1880, the caravan, which went by wagon, reached the capitol of Turkestan, Tashkend, where the above-mentioned Governor-General von Kauffman had provided quarters for them, and where they were permitted to remain with the support of the governor until they should find a favorable place for colonization. Here they remained a summer and two winters, being occupied for the most part with the hauling of stone for building purposes. Craftsmen found occupation in their various trades. It was during the temporary stay in Tashkend that the break came with Claas Epp, who more and more disclosed himself as a false prophet.

In this time also Governor-General von Kauffman, who had been so favorably inclined toward them, died. His successor took an altogether different attitude, unfortunately for the colonists. He told them that they had always been praised as a people of superior civilization and that they would now be expected to demonstrate that they had this reputation justly. He assigned them land for colonization about seventy kilometers distant from the city Aulie Ata, about three hundred fifty kilometers from Tashkend, in a valley called the Talas valley, named after the river which flows through it. Our fathers accepted this land for colonization, whereas Claas Epp, with his group which, it might be noted, had lived upon a large estate called "Kaplanbeck," outside the city of Tashkend, insisted that the Lord had revealed to them that they should go to Bokhara as the true city of refuge. The Claas Epp group therefore separated completely from the other group and made its way further to Bokhara.

II

The Beginning and Early Development of the Colony

In the spring of 1882 the Mennonites who had been living in the city of Tashkend started out anew on the road to founding a new home. As stated above, their new home was in the Talas valley, which lies between the Alexander Mountains and the Alatau Mountains, both ranges being a part of the great Tiauschau Moun-

tains. The valley is between fifteen and twenty kilometers wide and about two hundred kilometers long. The mountains which enclose the valley are covered with eternal snow. Out of the Alatau Mountains flow several rivers, namely, the Bishtash, the Ur-Mal, the Kummushtak, and the Karabura. These all flow together into the Talas, which takes its course along the foot of Alexander Mountains.

During the summer these rivers are quite full of water, since they are fed by the melting snows on the mountains. In the winter, however, they run quite shallow. The soil in the valley is a yellow clay and requires much moisture in order to support sufficient vegetation. For this reason the entire valley is covered with irrigation canals. Each piece of land that is cultivated, whether for grain, alfalfa, vegetables, or trees, will bring forth nothing without this artificial irrigation. But when the soil receives the necessary moisture everything grows in great abundance, particularly grass, trees, and grain. For the cultivation of vegetables, fruit, and alfalfa, additional fertilizer must be added to the soil. Up to the present time natural fertilizer has been used exclusively. With the proper cultivation, irrigation, and fertilization, everything grows extremely well.

At the time of the settlement there was not a single European settlement in the entire region of three hundred fifty kilometers between Tashkend and Aulie Ata. Farther beyond Aulie Ata, in the upper part of the Talas valley, there was a village of Russians composed of thirteen farmers. Our fathers found awaiting them a great uncultivated prairie, without a tree or a bush. For instance, if they wanted to have a handle for a fork, for a hoe, or for a spade, they had to make a trip of seventy kilometers to the city of Aulie Ata to fetch it.

The beginning of the colony was very difficult. It was pioneer work in the fullest sense of the word. When the colonists arrived on their land, they had to begin the cultivation of the fields. But the very first necessity, namely the seed to be planted, was missing. The Khirgiz Nomads who inhabited the valley had no grain at all to sell and nowhere was there a European settlement. The prospect for the future was quite dark. But God did not forsake our fathers who had made the long journey to Turkestan in full faith and trust in His divine aid, and with the deepest conviction that their course was right. After they had sought on all sides in vain to find help, they came upon the thought of asking a rich merchant by the name of Iwanoff to furnish them grain for seed and bread

until the harvest. This man was known to be very covetous and our fathers were told that they would not receive a hearing from him. But, driven by necessity, they decided to try. To the astonishment of all who knew the man, Iwanoff gave them the necessary amount of grain, with the stipulation that it should be paid in five installments, within a period of five years and without interest. It was a miracle in the eyes of man and if our brethren in America had not aided our fathers from time to time with money in this difficult period of beginning, the situation for them would have often become unbearable, but the Lord aided His people.

The material for building purposes was the clay of the valley, which could be made into excellent brick. The necessary timber could be secured in the pine forests in the mountain gorge called "Karagoin." The route to this high-lying gorge was extraordinarily difficult and at points indeed neck-breaking. Much trouble and trial accompanied the felling, as well as the hauling, of the lumber. The settlers were permitted to take the timber on condition that they plant an area of six hectares with young poplar seedlings. This was the so-called "kronswald," which was misunderstood by outsiders and described by P. M. Friesen in his book, *Die Alt-Evangelische Mennonitische Brüderschaft in Russland,* as a state forest in which supposedly our young men had to serve in the service of the state. It is worth mentioning that during the entire time in which the timber had to be brought from the mountains not a single important accident took place. Often it was the experience of the people that the hand of God visibly protected them from great disaster.

Gradually the economic life of the new colony developed. Besides the cultivation of grain, a valuable addition was the breeding of swine and horses. Pork was taken early in the autumn by wagon to the city of Tashkend, 350 kilometers away, where there was a good market. The horses were usually sold in the colony to purchasers from different towns near by. Later dairying was added, which in the last years furnished the chief occupation in the colony. Emphasis was laid upon pure-bred stock and the raising of the most possible dairy cattle in order to have milk to manufacture into cheese, to have a good source of income. As the population of the colony grew and the number of dairy cattle increased, it became impossible to find sufficient pasture for the cattle in the valley. For this reason it became necessary to take not only the young cattle, but also the dairy cows to the mountains for the summer. There the stock was pastured about three months. There the cows were

milked and the milk made into cheese, which was brought on the backs of camels into the valley. The regular trips of the camels up into the mountains brought to the herders and milkers and cheese-makers who lived there quite isolated and in the simplest possible conditions, food supplies and letters and news from the home in the valley. For this reason the camels were very welcome guests and were greeted with great joy when they appeared. In the winter months the cattle were fed with alfalfa, oil cake, and mangles. The latter were very abundant in the gardens of the colonists.

The growing of vegetables and garden produce developed rapidly. In addition to the mangles grown as feed for the stock, melons were also raised. For family use, sugar beets, sugar cane, and "mohrrüben" were grown. Great success was had with currants and raspberries. Gooseberries at first grew very well, but later became affected with a fungus growth.

Apples developed the best of all the fruits. A fruit expert who was compelled during the period of the Revolution to flee to this region and who knows the apple districts of western Europe very well said that he had never found such good apples. In addition to apples, of which there were many varieties, pears, plums, cherries, and apricots were grown.

In normal times the Mennonites had a very comfortable living in Turkestan, indeed they had attained a certain degree of prosperity and wealth and were able to live free of care from the economic point of view.

In the beginning four villages were settled, Köppenthal, Nicolaipol, Gnadental und Gnadenfeld. At the request of the government the villages were later re-baptized with Russian names and now are called Romanowka, Nicolaipol, Andrejewka, and Wladimirowka. Later the village of Orloff was founded. However, today there are more Lutherans than Mennonites in this village. Still later the village of Hohendorf was established, founded by immigrants from Khiva who had earlier been followers of Claas Epp. There is also in the valley another German village by the name of Johannesdorf, whose inhabitants are exclusively Lutherans and Adventists.

Near the city of Pischpeck (now Frunse) a daughter colony of the colony in Aulie Ata was established between the years 1924 and 1928. Under some of the severest economic handicaps the new settlement was established, chiefly by young and poor Mennonites. But the favorable location of the colony, the good soil, and the confidence in a better future stimulated the courage of the young set-

tlers in spite of the various hindrances which were laid in their way by the government. But up to the present time the new colony could not get really started because the prosperity of the population is directly undermined by the Soviet authorities.

Each village in the colony of Aulie Ata has its own school, which is served by a Mennonite teacher, although at present the schools are taught by communist teachers. In the schools the German language is the language of instruction. The Russian language is offered as a separate course. The schools were built and supported exclusively by the Mennonites who also paid the teachers themselves. There are two church houses in the colony, one in Andrejewka and one in Romanowka.

III.

The Church Life

Most of the settlers came from the Molotschna colony, where they had earlier left the old Mennonite Church under the leadership of a certain Abraham Peters, retaining however the old forms of baptism. The settlers who came from Samara still belonged to the old Mennonite Church, while several of the settlers from Kuban in the Caucasus belonged to the Mennonite Brethren Church. In Tashkend already, as mentioned above, all those who later went to Aulie Ata separated themselves from Claas Epp, whose teachings grew constantly more contradictory to the spirit of the Bible so that all those who still retained a sensible point of view of the Word of God were able to notice his error. When the group arrived at Aulie Ata the so-called Molotschna element accepted immersion and soon joined the group from the Kuban, so there were two churches in the colony, the so-called Mennonite Church and the Mennonite Brethren Church, but from the beginning the two groups were never at enmity. As far as the writer of these lines is acquainted with the church life of the Mennonites of the other settlements in Russia and Siberia and as far as other competent brethren can bear witness, the mutual relations of the two groups in Turkestan were the best of all the Mennonite colonies in Russia.

Although the Mennonite Brethren Church claimed to stand on the platform of accepting only truly regenerated persons as members, it gradually declined so much, due to various causes which need not be stated here, that it was no longer possible to maintain church discipline. Consequently several brethren and sisters of both groups, who observed with grief this decline, but could do nothing to stop it, left the two groups and formed a so-called Alliance Church. The

result was that the more earnest members of the Mennonite Brethren Church re-examined the situation and decided that they could not continue further as they were. So it finally came about that the entire M. B. Church was dissolved and re-organized anew, with definite regulations on the basis of the original discipline. The new Church was formed only out of those who could relate their personal experience with the Lord, no matter whether they belonged to the previous organization or not. In a word, each one had to go through an examination of his own inner life. So there arose a new Mennonite Brethren Church on the old basis.

Not long after, the Mennonite Church made the same change and was re-organized in the same manner, even adopting from that time immersion as the form of baptism. And so there were for a time three groups—the Mennonite Church, the Mennonite Brethren Church, and the Evangelical Mennonite Brotherhood (Alliance Church). At first the relationship between the three was unfortunately rather tense. Gradually however a more kindly feeling developed and in 1927 the two latter groups were united in one church. The two remaining churches which now exist side by side then drew up an agreement according to the following principles:

1. The trustees of the two churches agree to trust one another to direct the life of the two churches according to their best knowledge and to prevent evils which may arise.
2. Each feels himself obligated to admonish a brother or sister personally if need be, quite regardless of which church the erring member may be a member, and promises to report the case to the proper church authority according to Matthew 18:15-17 only if the admonition is without result.
3. Common meetings for edification are to be arranged for as much as possible.

This is the present situation of the churches in Turkestan. The membership of the Mennonite Brethren Church is about three hundred. That of the Mennonite Church is probably somewhat more. The above membership means active baptized members, the unbaptized not being included. As far as service to the state is concerned, we did not only remain free for fifteen years, as promised, but for forty years, that is up to the stabilization of the Soviet government. If in the course of these years now and then young men from Turkestan were to be found in the state forests and also at the time of the European war in the sanitary trains, in the hos-

pitals, and in the forests, they were always immigrants who had come to Turkestan after the first settlement and for that reason did not enjoy the privileges of the original colonists.

Nothing is left to-day in the colony at Aulie Ata of the chiliastic teaching which was present in the beginning.

Whether others will recognize the movement to Aulie Ata as a work of God or not, yet we must testify to the honor of God before the entire world that God blessed the way of our fathers in spite of all the human weakness which was among them, in a wonderful way, particularly in that He provided for the lengthening of the desired freedom from state service without the petition of our fathers to the government. His blessing was also upon the temporal welfare of the colony

The majority of the Mennonites in Khiva whither the followers of Claas Epp went have come to their senses in the course of time and abandoned the extreme chiliasm of their first period. However a portion of the group still maintains today the original teachings of Epp and even expects his return.

Editor's Note: The above article was written in the refugee camp at Möllin near Hamburg, Germany, in May, 1930. Bishop Janzen was among the refugees who escaped from Moscow in December, 1930. He has now emigrated to the new Mennonite colony near Hammonia in the state of Santa Catharina in southern Brazil.

TWO CENTURIES OF AMERICAN MENNONITE LITERATURE: AN APPRAISAL[1]

ERNST CORRELL

At the risk of being considered unfitted for the role of critic because of an intimate relationship with Professor Bender's undertaking, the writer ventures with hesitation this discussion of the former's bibliography of American Mennonite Literature. A bibliography, it must be admitted, however, usually does not call for critical annotations and does not present scientific, literary or other problems of the ordinary type.

The first question which naturally arises in connection with a bibliographical production is that of comprehensiveness of scope. All other questions are of a technical character and are of more or less minor importance. The principle and methods used in the "make-up", clear and effective though they may seem to the compiler, may not always fit the particular interests of certain investigators. Indexes may appear to be not sufficiently adjusted to the various research projects which require bibliographical information. And there is, after all, a limitation in any bibliography due to the general lack of a convenient technical device which would immediately open up to the research student the particular avenues he desires to travel. Even our mechanical and electrical age has not furnished such a magic table. Today, as always, the scholar must patiently search the facts and the books. In the true sense of the word he must be the "investigator", that is, the maker of footprints in the literary hunting-ground of his field, if such a simile and interpretation is permissible.

Professor Bender's *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature* presents to every student in this field, and associated fields shared by other than church historians, a guide to great possibilities. The quality of service which this bibliography offers is

---

[1] Harold S. Bender, *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature, A Bibliography of Mennonitica Americana* 1727-1928, [Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, No. 1]. Published by the Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. Indexes pp. 169-181.

essentially determined by its scope. And this is what strikes me as a non-Mennonite student of the problems involved. This bibliography is indeed more than a useful product of painstaking compilation. What we have in reality before us is the framework of American Mennonite history starting from the first settled period which allowed publication activities, and reaching into the modern era with its various groups, all of them faithfully reflected in their literary documents. American Mennonite history is made to reveal its own religious development. At the same time this development discloses more than mere church-historical facts, for the genuine Anabaptist-Mennonite traditions were not frozen and forced into the political structure of a state church but followed an independent course. Mennonite history involves the rather independent social and economic forms and forces of a religiously determined organism. In addition, American (in contrast to European) Mennonite history has multiplied racial and language distinctions, furnishing a new and very significant additional accent on the European tradition of this religious minority group. Numerous sociological problems are involved and here again the bibliography presents a reliable preliminary orientation. This is the basic scientific contribution it offers. It is one which will make all future students indebted and all present students grateful for the opportunities the bibliography affords for rechecking and revising the previous studies in the field of American Mennonite history.

As No. 1 of the series of "Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History", the *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature* indicates the character and methods which the editors had in view when the project was launched. While past workers in Anabaptist-Mennonite history deserve all credit for what they have accomplished, they would no doubt be the first to agree that the lack of a systematic organization of the source-material was to them a severe handicap. Of course, the writing of history (except diplomatic history) may be begun with almost no organization of the basic sources. While this will not make for the best history nor adequately prepare for sound historical judgments, it may serve to arouse interest in the field. In all fields there have been historians with slight preparation for their work; they have, however, paved the way and created an atmosphere for progress. But the time has come to prepare a broader and deeper basis for Mennonite history. More appropriately we should speak of our series as "Sources and Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History", for the supply of carefully edited historical "raw material" is one of the foremost

aims of the project. Professor Bender's book and other "Studies" in the future will, we hope, open up the treasures of Anabaptist-Mennonite history and aid in furnishing more secure evidence and more accessible verification than were hitherto available.

For the American section of Mennonite history the sort of "bibliography" we are now happy to possess offers a more significant groundwork than the same type of "directory" would offer for the European section. In both cases, of course, the insight furnished into the forms of religious self-expression would be alike worth-while. But in America much more than in Europe, literary "Mennonitica" reflect the very life and fate of the group, in many cases even furnishing almost the only information extant. In Europe it has been otherwise. There Mennonite history has been reflected in various ways. The European Mennonites remained in a constant (however strained) coördination with the political body of which they were a part. The state churches continued to oppress the legally condemned sects and this oppression wrote the history of European Mennonites into many a political or legal record. No such records are extant from early American Mennonite history aside from scanty immigration or oath-of-allegiance records. In other words, tolerance and the freedom of movement over an entire continent which the American Mennonites could enjoy were less productive of historical impressions. This makes the student of American Mennonite history much more dependent on immediate Mennonite sources, such as Mennonite literature. The efforts of Professor Bender in compiling his bibliography together with his interest and that of his associates in establishing on such a systematic basis a Mennonite historical library at Goshen College will be welcome as a very promising nucleus for further research and publications in American Mennonite history.

The present writer is not prepared to render a professional judgment on the degree of philological reliability and accuracy of this bibliography. However in observing a good deal of its development and in assisting to some extent in its formation, he has learned to appreciate the problems involved and the manner in which they were solved. It can safely be said that Professor Bender's contribution bears comparison with the type of leading European bibliographies which the writer has had occasion to use in related fields.

Discussion

The future student will esteem all the information which the author added in the various historical notes as real "grains of gold." It must be

said, however, that those who are familiar with Anabaptist-Mennonite history will experience certain disappointments in reading both the preface and some of the historical notes. There are blanks under certain titles, for instance where important information is entirely lacking, information which, it is true, only the few experts in the field will "knowingly" miss. They will feel sorry that the newcomer is thus not initiated into solved problems, but rather left to efforts which could happily have been avoided. While sharing the responsibility for such failing as co-editor, I am especially sorry that, as far as I could see, throughout the work not one reference is made to that foremost book of information on Anabaptist-Mennonite history, the MENNONITISCHES LEXIKON, 1913 ff., which has reached at the present time its 21st instalment. We certainly must ask the indulgence of its editors, our learned friends, Christian Hege and Dr. Theol. Christian Neff, in Germany. They will, of course, realize with us that the LEXIKON is rather incomplete in regard to Mennonitica Americana in spite of their intense interest in contributions on American Mennonite history. But at any rate the preface of the Bibliography should have referred to the cyclopaedic character of the MENNONITISCHES LEXIKON which finally will make it the most comprehensive source of Anabaptist-Mennonite information in general.

Not having undertaken a systematic comparison of the BIBLIOGRAPHY and the LEXIKON, it is only with caution that I make the suggestion that a compiler of Mennonitica Americana could have found material in the latter. At any rate it would have been worth while to check the LEXIKON for authors and titles listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY when the latter was drawn up. The writer happened to learn by chance from an article by J. Horsch on "Burkholder, Christian," Lexikon volume I, page 302, that there was a seventh edition, Elkhart, 1902, of the NUTZLICHE UND ERBAULICHE ANREDE of 1804. On page 303 the same author (Art. Burkholder, Peter) indicates EINE VERHANDLUNG UEBER DIE WASSER-TAUFE OF 1816 (listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY) as having been a pamphlet against the Dunkers. It cannot be expected, of course, that future students will have to resort to the LEXIKON to make the BIBLIOGRAPHY complete. It is rather the forthcoming portion of the LEXIKON which on the basis of Professor Bender's BIBLIOGRAPHY will offer fuller information on American Mennonite Literature. This fact has already become evident in the latest instalment (21st) of the MENNONITISCHEN LEXIKON, volume II, including litera "H" ending in an article on the "Herold der Wahrheit." Nevertheless no student in any field of Mennonite history can afford to proceed without the LEXIKON. While the compiler of the BIBLIOGRAPHY omitted on policy almost all notes about the authors of the books listed—a policy to be regretted in certain historical cases—the LEXIKON will often come to the rescue. A general reference in the preface should have reminded the reader of some of the outstanding American articles, which, in addition, were in part prepared by American writers. There is, for all students concerned with Mennonite problems, Chr. Hege's informative discussion on "Geschichtschreibung, Mennonitische". Not to speak of the large series of articles on local American communities and sketches of American Mennonite leaders, there are H P. Krehbiehl's "Allgemeine Conferenz", Neff's article "Amerika", "Amerikenische Heidenmission . . . ", Horsch's article "Alt-Mennoniten", ETC. The German edition of the MARTYRER-

Spiegel is so significantly an American undertaking that it should have been listed with the original Dutch title in full, together with a few data in Professor Bender's concise fashion on Van Braght, its original compiler, and also on the artist of the 1685 Dutch edition (J. Luyken) the high-class illustrations of which were rather poorly reproduced in the Elkhart 1886 English edition. H. Westra's article on "Braght" in the Mennonitisches Lexikon would have furnished these data.

The technical factors which prevented Professor Bender from giving more elaborate historical notes are not only due to the competition of his historical interests with other time-consuming duties, but also to the financial difficulties which restrict the printing and publication of the Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History. Thus discoveries made during the preparation of the Bibliography could for such reasons not always be included in the normal run of the earlier sections which were printed months before the latter part. Appendix VIII carries such revisions and additions. The years to come will produce still more items of this sort since the Bibliography naturally will have a stimulating effect. Later a completely revised edition will take care of "deficiencies" that are the common "by-product" of the type of brave pioneer work which Professor Bender has done.

Those more at home in the European background of the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement will be delighted to see the various items listed in "The Colonial Period, 1727-1799," which indicate so clearly the historical abutments of American Mennonite literature. Here is where one would have especially liked the bibiliography to be more specific in its historical notes. In a few of the striking instances we wish to make the following suggestions which a future writer on the history of American Mennonite Literature could utilize.

The Christian Confession of the Faith of the Harmless Christians, commonly known as the "Dordrecht Confession," printed for the Pennsylvania Mennonites at their request by the Amsterdam Doopsgezinde in The Netherlands, reveals the Dutch Mennonites as the foster-parents of the American Mennonite settlers even in regard to religious literature. As a matter of fact the earliest group of Pennsylvania Mennonites was essentially of Dutch origin (the first Germantown settlers, a very small group, however, coming from Crefeld and other portions of the Lower Rhine valley). The influx of genuine Swiss Brethren from German intermediary settlements and from Switzerland directly occurred later.

That the two first items of the Bibliography should be in the English language is a puzzle. The bibliographer should have tried to explain the cause of the English version of this "Dordrecht Confession." Far into "The Recent Period" (1861-1904) publications in the German language form the overwhelming majority. As it was, the American branch was even creative in producing the first German translation of Het Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaarspiegel in 1748 which the "vereinigte Bruederschaft in Europa" eagerly reprinted in 1780 in Germany. The assumption is most likely that the English editions of the Dordrecht Confession in 1712 and 1727 were needed by the Pennsylvania Mennonites for political purposes, that is to justify themselves for some reason or

other before the British authorities or their own neighbors.[2] It may also be possible to learn more definitely about the causes of the appearance in English of the "Dordrecht Confession" in 1712 and 1727 by research in the Doopsgezinde Archive in Amsterdam.

The "Dordrecht Confession" in leading the Mennonitica Americana has a unique chronological and linguistic significance besides its possible political importance. But there is also significance in its leading position among the items of Part I (The Mennonite Church proper). After all, the historian is confronted by obstructing lines of development when attempting to straighten out the traditional divisions of Anabaptist and Mennonite bodies. Certain historians continue to be confused when facing the 16th and 17th century developments in Europe and still more so when approaching the 19th century divisions and movements characteristic of the Mennonite bodies in America and in Russia. The rough but (for earlier periods) effective method of discriminating Swiss, Dutch, and Hutterian Brethren is not sharp enough for more recent conditions and movements. Migrations, changing geographical groupings, national affairs, mission work, educational influences, mergers, economic changes, various types of progressiveness, and emancipation movements of all sorts have burst the bonds of tradition handicapping those who try to trace the various historical traditions and changes in Mennonite bodies. From this point of view the skeleton of the American Mennonite groups as presented in the BIBLIOGRAPHY will prove an aid to all who are looking for clear and positive information on the organization of the Mennonite bodies in the American world. Professor Bender includes the Amish group in "The Mennonite Church," an arrangement which for a very distinct period would have been impossible. Inadvertently the "Dordrecht Confession," by ranking at the head of this section, offers itself as the best justification. For in the shadow of the Thirty Years War, Mennonites of all origins and groups (not uniformly, however) were able to endorse the 18 Articles of Dordrecht, originally called the BEKENNTNIS VON ADRIAAN CORNELISSEN OF CONFESSIE DES CHRISTELYKEN GELOOFS, GETHROKKEN UIT DE VREDEHANDELING, GESCHIED TE DORTRECHT IN DEM JARE 1632 OP DEN 21. APRIL TUSSCHEN DE DOOPSGEZINDE, DIE MAN VLAMINGEN NOEMT. The Dutch background of this confession, however interesting and impressive it is, has no bearing on the problem under consideration, but it may be worth while to state that Adriaan Corneliss, the drafter of the confession, descended from a prominent martyr family and was Elder of the Flemish community of Dordrecht in the province of South-Holland. The Dordrecht "Flamish Doopsgezinden Gemeente" was the most flourishing one in Holland at that time. It became also the background of the MARTYR'S MIRROR, in as much as Tieleman Jansz van Braght was its minister from 1648 on.[3] The point to be made here is that this so-

[2] For possible explanations see Wilbur J. Bender's *Pacifism Among the Mennonites . . . of Pennsylvania to* 1783, MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, July 1927, ff., which treatise is to be a forthcoming volume of the *Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History.*

[3] See the very informative articles on "Dordrecht" by K. Vos, on *Dordrechter Bekenntnis* by Neff in "Mennonitisches Lexikon," vol. I.

called Dordrecht Confession found endorsement by several groups of the Swiss Brethren before the Amish schism, in the last decade of the 17th century, created two groups which were led, respectively, by Jakob Ammann and by Hans Reist. The Amish group, as a matter of fact, leaned on a stricter interpretation of the "Dordrecht Confession." From this point of view it appears absolutely proper for Professor Bender to include the Amish without further discrimination in what he calls "The Mennonite Church." The second apparent reason, which is of no less historical significance, lies in the fact that the majority of the Amish have been and apparently are continuing to shift in to "The Mennonite Church" proper.[4]

The confessional basis of the structure of "The General Conference of Mennonites of North America" which forms Part II in the BIBLIOGRAPHY appears to be less definite. This writer is however not in a position to investigate the historical character of THE CATECHISM which was adopted from "The Christian Communion, called Mennonites, in Waldeck." It is listed as one of the items of Part II. One regrets that the explanatory note does not indicate the relationship of this catechism to a confession of faith. A definite relationship of that kind most likely exists. It would be of particular interest to know whether or not it is based on a 1766 Confession which also had been drafted by a Dutch Mennonite, Cornelis Ris, minister of the Doopsgezinde Gemeente at Hoorn, Northern Holland, a confession widely accepted and translated from the Dutch into the German.[5] A German and an English version of the Ris Confession is indeed found in the General group as listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY pages 108 and 109 for 1906 and 1904 respectively. What is the background and significance of Part II of the 1882 item KATECHISMUS DER CHRISTLICHEN LEHRE VON DER ALLGEMEINEN KONFERENZ DER MENNONITEN IN NORD-AMERIKA DEN GEMEINDEN DARGEBOTEN? While much can be learned from H. P. Krehbiel's Article "Allgemeine Konferenz der Mennoniten in Nord-Amerika," MENNONITISCHES LEXIKON, Volume I, on questions raised by the BIBLIOGRAPHY, confessional aspects receive no particular attention in Krehbiel's article.

In selecting these two rather outstanding problems in regard to Confessions of Faith, the writer has chosen those having a specific sociological bearing. The thorough survey of publications in that direction which we owe to the BIBLIOGRAPHY should encourage individual studies in order to produce in the near future a collection and commentary of Anabaptist-Mennonite confessions similar to W. J. McGlothlin's, BAPTIST CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, Philadelphia, 1901.

In answer to the question whether or not the early Pennsylvania Mennonites had "books with Confessions of Faith," a letter written by one of them in 1773 made the following remarkable statement: "In the first place, we recognize the Holy Scriptures, especially the Evangelists, for our chief rule." Then the letter-writer refers to religious literature

---

[4] Attention should be called in this respect to the helpful survey by John Horsch in his article "Alt-Mennoniten" also Neff's articles "Altamische Mennoniten," "Amische Mennoniten" and "Ammann, Jacob," in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, vol. I, which round out the picture.

[5] Neff article, "Bekenntnisse des Glaubens," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, vol. I, p. 160.

including the Dordrecht Confession, and other titles listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY with the exception of one—Joost Henricks—most likely not an American imprint.[6] What is of foremost interest to us here, is that the Pennsylvania Mennonites answered the question put to them by the Dutch Mennonites in regard to "Confessions" by so emphatically pointing to the Bible, that is to the New Testament in particular, as their "chief rule." From that angle, giving the strongest historical perspective of the Anabaptist tradition, it seems almost strange that a Bibliography of Mennonitica Americana does not report on Mennonite Bible editions other than on very recent Mennonite translations of portions of the Bible in the Indian Cheyenne and Hopi languages. The distinct use of and the preference given by both the Swiss and Dutch Mennonites to certain German and Dutch translations (The "Froschauer Bible," Zurich, 1525, resp., 1533 and 1536, last European reprint 1825; the "Biestkens-Bibel," 1558, last European reprint 1723 in the Netherlands) is not likely to have been discarded by the American Mennonite settlers. True there was one edition of the Froschauer Testament in 1787 in Ephrata, Pennsylvania (*Bibliography*, page 7). By way of comparison it is of interest that the Dutch Mennonite settlers in Western Prussia as early as 1585 had their own Bible edition printed.[7] From where came the supply for the much greater demand for Bibles needed by an increasing body, during the two centuries of American Mennonite life? When and how was the English Bible substituted for German and Dutch Bibles? We would have wished our bibliographer to have made some reference to this problem or that he would have presented a list of those Froschauer Bibles which were found in the possession of American Mennonite families. The Goshen College Mennonite Historical Library is the happy possessor of original editions of the Froschauer Bible of 1531, 1534, and 1536 brought over by European Mennonite immigrants.[8]

And here is the renowned hymnbook, the *Ausbund*, which reaches from the 16th century dungeon in the Bavarian fortress of Passau right into present day American Amish congregations. How many people today realize the unique fact that there is still in use in America a 1922 edition of a hymnal composed by genuine Anabaptists and handed down through approximately 350 years, unchanged in its solemn though "primitive" quaintness both in words and tune? More faithfully than the blood descendants of these early martyrs the *Ausbund* conveys the holy spirit of Anabaptist beginnings. However simple this Anabaptist testimony of the 16th century may appear, to find it unchanged still in use as song-book makes it stand out as a living monument. As such it casts a venerable

6 For this interesting sample test of Professor Bender's bibliography see "A Letter from Pennsylvania to Holland in 1773" in *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, October 1929, 230 f.

7 Nestle, article, "Bibelnebzertsetzungen, niederlandische" in *Herzog's Realenzyklopaedie fuer Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3. Auflage, volume III, p. 122.

8 For further details see the expert articles by Adolf Fluri on "Froschauer," the printer, and on "Froschauer Bibeln und Testamente," and Neff's articles on "Bibeluebersetzungen" and the Dutch "Biestkens-Bibel" and "Biestkens" its printer, in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon*.

shadow over the "Plymouth Rock" type of symbols of similar religious emigrant groups in America.

There is another most significant publication of European origin, an elaborate catalogue of the Christian martyrs with particular emphasis on Anabaptists and Mennonites, known as the *Martyrs' Mirror.* It is the product of the literary labors of the Dutch Doopsgezinde and was first published under the title *Het offer des Heeren* in 1562 (two years before the supposedly first edition of the Swiss-German *Ausbund*). In 1660 Tieleman Jansz van Braght, minister of the Doopsgezinde Gemeente at Dortrecht, Holland, published the enlarged edition as the *Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaerspiegel der Doopsgezinde en Weerloose Christienen.* This-voluminous work was not only a very much revised and improved edition of the before-mentioned *Het Offer des Heeren* (both songbook and martyr-catalogue) but also a much more comprehensive representation of the martyr history checked by official and other sources which the learned van Braght could utilize at a time when at least the northern European Mennonites had rest from persecution. For the historian of the Swiss Anabaptist group this compilation is of specific interest since it contains authentic reports by the early Swiss Brethren of the persecution they suffered in Canton Zurich in the years 1635-1645. These reports make the *Martyrs' Mirror* an almost contemporary witness. One must also recall in this connection that the Dutch Mennonites at that time undertook vigorous attempts to interfere through the Government of their country with the methods of persecution applied in the Zurich, Bern and other Swiss cantons against the Anabaptists when the Thirty Years War and its consequences had created afresh the conscientious objector problem. The *Wahrhafftiger Bericht von den Brüdern im Schweitzerland i. d. Züricher Gebiet, Wegen der Trübsalen, welche über sie ergangen seyn, um des Evangeliums willen. Vom dem 1635. bis in das 1645. Jahr* became the major source of the last portion of the Dutch *Martyrs' Mirror.* It is found reproduced in full in the first American *Ausbund* edition of 1742. An official copy of the *Warhafftiger Bericht* rests in the *Stadtbibliothek* at Zurich, Switzerland. Is not the appearance of the *Warhafftiger Bericht* in the first edition of the American *Ausbund* an interesting anticipation of the famous German-American *Märtyrer Spiegel* of 1748? Such aspects are of greater significance than the statement in connection with the 1748 *Märtyrer Spiegel* to the effect that "It was the largest book printed in the American colonies before the Revolution."

Now that the enormous work in compiling the Mennonitica Americana has been completed it is not difficult to point out neglected titles, although but few are of any great significance.

Appendix III, "American Publications on the Mennonites or Anabaptists by Non-Mennonites" had not been planned in the original scope of the compilation. While therefore, criticism of this section is not warranted, the presence of the appendix will invite misunderstanding and at the same time be conducive of suggestions. It appears that when Professor Bender drew up this appendix he had in mind only a list of entire books or pamphlets devoted exclusively to the Mennonites by non-Mennonite American authors or publishers. A future revision should however enlarge the scope for certain items along the borderline because of the par-

ticular merits of such cases. There is, for instance, W. J. McGlothlin's *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* Philadelphia 1901, the *only* (though not always reliable) collection of genuine Anabaptist Articles of Faith in English version. Appendix III should certainly include the consolidated report of the 1926 Census of Religious Bodies on *Mennonite Bodies, Statistics, Denominational History, and Organization,* U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1928—an entire pamphlet of 76 pages devoted exclusively to the group under discussion. This publication is in addition a most helpful complement to the *Bibliography* with the advantage of having been checked by such experts as J. A. Ressler, editor of the *Mennonite Year Book,* Scottdale, Pennsylvania, and J. W. Tschetter, Chicago, Illinois. The appendix should also include some of the works by S. W. Pennypacker and M. G. Brumbaugh referred to in the historical text. Particularly Pennypacker's productions are of basic significance in the historiography of American Mennonites and of no less importance than J. L. Rosenberger's recent contributions, one of which was included. How about Mennonite family histories, produced by Non-Mennonites?—While it would be impossible and worthless to list all fiction titles on American Mennonite life and customs a few of the outstanding ones would be of interest. Most of these literary characterizations are no less incorrect than European attempts of the kind. It would be most worthwhile for Mennonite students to investigate this type of descriptions and to deal with it in the same fair and critical fashion, in which J. B. Cressman discussed B. Mabel Dunham's stories. (See his reviews in the January 1930 Mennonite Quarterly Review, pp. 68-72). In some cases the faithfulness of the observations is amazing. This is particularly true of Theodore Fontane's "Quitt" (1891), the truly American Mennonite background of which (Oklahoma), still remains a puzzle as to Fontane's medium of observation. (See Correll, article, "Fontane," *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* volume I. Here are a few more titles which should belong to Appendix III. Found by chance they are given bibliographically incomplete and not verified: H. M. Bowman, "Jacob Y. Shantz, pioneer of the Russian Mennonite immigration to Manitoba," *Waterloo Historical Society Report,* XII, 85-100; B. Mabel Dunham, "Some 'Plain' People of Canada," *Canadian Magazine,* LXII, 188-195, referred to as an "historical account of Mennonite migrations to Canada"; Young, Gertrude S., "A record concerning Mennonite Immigration, 1873," *American Historical Review,* XXIX, 518-522. Although most of these are articles only, they should be listed as they relate to subjects hardly treated otherwise. Further titles to be included: Schmidt, C. B., "Reminiscences of Foreign Immigration Work," *Kansas Historical Collections,* IX, pp. 484 ff.; Sanger, S. F. and Hays, D.,*The Olive Branch of Peace and Goodwill to Men; anti-war history of the Brethren and Mennonites, etc., during the Civil War,"* Brethren Publishing House, Elgin, Illinois.

Appendix IV on "Publications in Cheyenne and Hopi by Mennonite missionaries" offers several suggestions aside from the Indian field. Mennonite missionary activities keep aloof from political and trade expansion programs. The American funds employed are fed by savings from an almost exclusively agricultural constituency. That does not make the American Mennonite missionary a political peace maker or a commercial contact man. His work carries the traditional stamp of Anabaptist independence. That aspect would be worth an independent study. Appendix

IV could well have been expanded to a summary report on all literary evidences of similar activities in the Mission field, in India, China, South America, etc. Mennonite work among the North American Indians is truly remarkable. In line with the rare linguistic efforts in early Hispanic and French America, and of John Eliot's 17th century translation of the Bible into the language of the Massachusetts "praying Indians", the Cheyenne and Hopi translations by Mennonite missionaries and their specific contributions to linguistics are of recognized importance. This is particularly true of the anthropological and ethnographic by-products of Mennonite missionaries. The *Handbook of American Indians north of Mexico,* Bureau of American Ethnology, F. W. Hodge, editor, Washington, 1907, contains many references to their observations and researches. J. M.'s article on Missions is of special interest in this respect. Henry R. Voth's studies in connection with the Stanley McCormick Hopi expedition, listed in the body of the Bibliography (with the exception of some of those in collaboration with the ethnologist B. A. Dorsey) are outstanding. European scholars did not fail to take notice of the observations of American Mennonite Missionaries on aboriginals. References to Valdo Petter and H. R. Voth, for example are contained in an article entitled "Ethnologische Beobachtugen aus dem Westen Nord-Amerikas . . . " in *Zeitschrift für ethnologie,* Organ der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 1889, page 475, both men being quoted as main authorities on certain mysterious tribal customs.

Appendix V, presenting a chronological hymnody, brings light on the history of Anabaptist-Mennonite worship. Very much in contrast to characteristics of certain Puritan groups of English origin these continental European Non-Conformists early showed a strong sense and appreciation for hymns as their only church music. The objection by Conrad Grebel to singing altogether (1524) did not carry any influence. The writing of hymns by the early Anabaptists was on many occasions the depositing of history, of biographies in particular. Collections of early hymns in the Hutterite songbook and in the Ausbund are esteemed as rare sources of German folkloristic, the transplantation of which to America stands out as an interesting phenomenon also from the point of view of the "Pennsylvania German" problem. Our bibliographer should have referred to Rudolph Wolkan's historical and critical study, *Die Lieder der Wiedertaeufer,* Berlin 1903, which is still an essential discussion. The chronological survey of Appendix V indicates for a growing majority of the American Mennonites a departure from the exclusive use of hymns of Anabaptist and Mennonite origin early in the 19th century. This departure coincides with other signs of "progressiveness." There was, it is of interest to note, no natural development and adaptation of Ausbund traditions. A few English versions of parts of early Anabaptist hymns were prepared by the Baptist historian H. S. Burrage, however for literary interests only. It should have been mentioned where these translations could be found. (*Baptist Hymn Writers and their Hymns,*) Portland Maine, 1888. Part *III* of this Appendix dealing with "reformed Mennonites" fails to list the 1858 "Kleine Leider-Samlung," the English of which is listed. However, it is found in the body of the Bibliography (page 123). The English-German combination of the two is of interest from the point of view of the

language problem. While visiting among members of the Reformed Mennonite Church in Upper New York State I had the opportunity to become acquainted with some of the literature of this exclusive group. It would have been of value to quote the following introductory note to the English portion of the before mentioned hymn-book; "A few German Hymns in English letters will be found in the following pages for the benefit of those unacquainted with the German Language. The number of the Hymns accord with those in the German book so both books may be used at the same time." There is a 1910 edition of the same hymn book, published in Lancaster, Pennsylvania by the Intelligencer Printing House (not listed in the Bibliography) which does not carry the German portion any longer. Other titles found among the "Reformed Mennonites" which the Bibliography does not list: "Herr, John, *Guidance by Grace, 39* pages, no year, (contains a list of books and tracts sold by David N. Long, La Salle, New York); *A Discourse on Baptism and Treatise on 1st Peter 2nd, 9-10,* published by the Reformed Mennonite Church, 1921, signed by Bishop Jacob S. Lehman, R. D. 10, Chambersburg, Pa., 43 pages; *Sermon, spoken at Landisville, Pa.,* by Wilmer Steele, Port Colborne, Ontario, no year, (1925?), 20 pages.

Appendix VI presents a classified chronological list of American periodicals which offers a good survey of the growing importance of this kind of publication activities. They go back as far as 1836, which is an early period when one takes into account that publishers and readers still were pioneer settlers. The pioneer character of this period also explains to some extent why the *Evangelischer Botschafter* ceased after its first issue in 1836 and why further publication of periodicals was not resumed before 1852 after which they became a dominant factor in American Mennonite literary history. It is to be regretted that the compiler expressly excluded the calendars of conferences and minutes of conventions from this chronological survey. The latter were, in writing or printed, the earliest "periodical" Mennonite publications and must be considered as the forerunners of periodicals proper both in European and American Mennonite History. Naturally, to achieve any accuracy in arranging such classifications is almost impossible at a later date and guesswork is easily misleading. A statement by Professor Bender in that connection (page 15, note to the Ontario Calendar of 1836) needs revision. He goes too far in the assumption that this booklet is the oldest regular periodical "possibly by Mennonites anywhere in the world." Chr. Hege in article "Deutsche Zeitschriften", *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* Volume I, page 421, refers to a Dutch list of names of ministers as early as 1796, revised in the German language and issued in Danzig in 1802 and in later years. The *Doopsgezind Jaarboekje,* 190 ff. should not be confused with the *Jaarboekje voor de Doopsgezinde Gemeenten in de Neederlanden* first issue in 1837 preceding the *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen.* (For details see the corresponding articles by A. Binnerts and Dr. Neff in *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* volume I.

A further appendix containing family histories listed in the body of the Bibliography would have added to the value of the book since family histories still are an important source of Mennonite history. A. J. Fretz is no Mennonite author hence his books are not listed. The

economic historian and students of the Western movement in general would have appreciated an appendix listing all those publications which have had a direct bearing on American Mennonite settlements. Of unique interest in this connection is the 1878 *Nebraska Ansiedler* the predecessor of the *Mennonitische Rundschau* once subsidized by the Burlington and Mo. River Rlrd. Company. (See pages 44f of the Bibliography.)

The particular interests of future research students will call for other arrangements of the data offered. Let us hope that such logical developments of the *Bibliography* will find their way into the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* in which the work was once launched. It would be a practical feature of this periodical to run a section which would systematically take up missing titles and as yet incomplete bibliographical data and also keep the lists up to date, until a revised edition is needed. Improvements other than those necessitated by missing data and new appendix arrangements can hardly be suggested. The rest of Professor Bender's industrious work is well done. This is especially true of his selection of the splendid plates which illustrate the Bibliography and with it—American Mennonite History.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

NOTES

I

A DOCUMENT ON THE MENNONITE COLONY IN TURKESTAN

Editor's Note

The following "Call for Help" was found among a collection of old papers secured from the estate of the late John F. Funk of Elkhart, Indiana. It appeared in both German and English. According to Franz Bartsch, **Unser Auszug nach Mittelasien,** (Halbstadt, 1907) twenty families actually emigrated to the United States from Chiwa in 1884. It may be safely assumed therefore that the "Call for Help" was issued in 1884, and that it produced the desired funds. In estimating the validity of the analysis as well as the facts stated in the "Call," it should be remembered that the "Call" was apparently drawn up on the basis of letters written from members of the twenty families of the Epp group who wished to leave Chiwa. It is quite possible that in their appeal they presented as favorable as possible a picture of the case, and attempted to justify as much as possible their actions. This will explain some of the differences between the information given in the "Call," and that of the article in this issue by Bishop Janzen.

A CALL FOR HELP

To all Mennonites for the non-resistant Brethren in Khiva, to bring them to America.

With regard to a little flock of non-resistant Christians, who have turned their eyes toward us and sent their petition for means to help them over to America, we would approach the hearts of our brethren in the faith with the words of the apostle, "To do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

This little flock, seeking help, are Mennonites, who on account of their entire non-resistant confession sought to escape the military service required of all in Russia. They belonged mostly to the Mennonite Churches which had settled in the interior of Russia, on the river Volga upon a guarantee of privileges. By the law promulgated in 1874, subjecting all to military duty, their privileges were annulled and Mennonites, though not required to bear arms, were yet compelled to give a stated number of years to the service of the government.

In as much as their conscience would not allow them to perform such service in 1880-81, 119 families moved from there and from the Southern Colonies on the Molotschna, and took up their journey toward Asiatic Russia, where in Turkestan, they, for a time, had some prospect of protection; this prospect, however, was in vain; the govern-

ment adhered to its demands, conceding however a grant of fifteen years, on condition that their young men, who were of proper age, should enter the service.[1] The company now became divided into two nearly equal portions; the one party accepted the offer of the government, and were given a place near Aulieata, not far from the city of Taschkent, while the other had to seek for them a home in another locality. They moved toward the border of Bokhara, but were not permitted to enter the country, and suffered much severe treatment, being now driven to one side of the line and then back again on the other, and threats were even made to have them all shot. By the intercession and proposal of the Russian Governors there, they were brought through Bokhara, to Khiva, where a powerless Khan is trying to rule wild hordes of Turcomans and others. Here in the vicinity of the city of Nukas, they intended to found their new home, and to live unto the Lord according to his word. In the winter of 1882-83, those 60 families began with the erection of primitive dwellings made of dried clay; also a meetinghouse, etc. Soon, however, the dark side began to appear, especially in the barbarity of those savage tribes, which were under the subjection of no human government. Small thefts, undertaken first stealthily, grew to pillaging expeditions, in which the robbers made use of fire-arms and sabres—certainly a hard trial for Christians of a non-resistant profession. Even the women were, and still are, not safe from abduction, though, thanks to God, such attempts (notwithstanding, a murder that arose from such cause), have not been successful at the last accounts. Though we must admit that their leaving civilization and Christendom to go into a desert, peopled by savage tribes, was a mistake, yea, an aberration of faith. We, like the merciful Samaritan, in view of the great distress that has come upon this little flock, have to deal only with the present; they are fellow-believers, who are now in exceedingly great distress, and who recognizing with bitterness their mistake, imploringly stretch out their arms towards us for help. Thus among others, John Jantzen, a minister of that church, writes to us as follows:

"In this distress, we fix our thoughts and eyes upon America; we remember the many invitations that have come to us from there: 'Come to us; here is full liberty of conscience, and security.' Once we would not believe it and went our own way. You may imagine that our means have dwindled down greatly; hence a journey to America is at present impossible for us, unless help comes from there. — Have you a heart to give us the means for the journey, the Lord will not suffer it to go unrecompensed. — Whatsoever you have done unto the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me. We have committed the matter to the Lord and will regard it as his will that we shall go there, if he gives us the means."

Besides this letter, from which the above passages are taken, several letters were simultaneously received by different brethren in our Church, all contained this urgent appeal: Have compassion and

[1] This statement is in error. According to the statement by Bishop Janzen, the writer of the preceding article, no service was required.

help. They kindly requested an answer by telegraph that the time of their distress might be shortened. A dispatch was accordingly sent from here on the 2nd of April, notifying them that their appeal was received, and that steps are to be taken to procure the needed funds. Truly the distress is great, and help is urgent. To whom do not here come the words of the apostle, James 3:17, "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

The demand made in this case upon Christian generosity is not a small one, and it is therefore advisable to take a general survey of it. That distressed little flock consists of 60 families, but so far all have not applied for help; about half have determined to remain there, and to wait for the special help of the Lord; the remainder of whom, up to this time, over twenty families (having decided to come) have applied for help. Probably many of the others also, if not all of them, when pressed by the exigencies of events, will yet join them. The traveling expenses from Khiva to Saratow, their former home, they hope to defray with their own means; but from there they are dependent upon help. The expenses from Saratow to Nebraska or Kansas would be about 80 dollars per person, at the cheapest rates. Counting five persons to each family, it would take $400.00 per family. Having now briefly described the circumstances and condition of these needy people, we lay the matter earnestly to the hearts of our fellow believers. The apostle says, "Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." Let us therefore be prepared to help them in their suffering, that we may also rejoice with them when it is said, II Cor. 9:12, "For the administration of this service, not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God." The apostle also encourages very earnestly to such service, when he points to him who can and will bless the cheerful giver, when he says, II Cor. 9:8, "And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye always, having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." May the Lord, who loveth a cheerful giver, awaken a true fraternal love in every heart. With prayerful confidence we commend the whole matter to his care. May he in this also give both to will and to do according to his good pleasure.

L. E. Zimmerman, John Penner, J. G. Wiebe, Peter Janzen, John V. Steen, Committee.

Gerhard Penner, Bishop; J. H. Zimmerman, Minister; Andreas Penner, Minister; Peter Reimer, Minister; L. E. Zimmerman, Deacon.
of the Mennonite Church, Beatrice, Gage Co., Nebr.

All collections and contributions for the above purpose to be sent to

L. E. Zimmerman,
Beatrice, Gage Co., Nebr.

NOTES

II

JOHN SMYTH AND THE DUTCH MENNONITES—A COMMUNICATION

Editor's Note

The editors are grateful for the following letter from Dr. W. T. Whitley, Hon. Secretary of the (English) Baptist Historical Society of Chelmsford, England. Dr. Whitley calls attention to some very interesting facts about the relation of John Smyth to the Mennonites in Amsterdam, which correct in part the statement made by Professor Burkhart on this point, in his study on "Menno Simons on the Incarnation," and which throw valuable light on the exact position of Smyth and his group. The editors, together with Professor Burkhart, wish to express their appreciation to Dr. Whitley for his valued contribution.

Chelmsford, England, 17 September, 1930.

To the Editor of the Mennonite Quarterly Review,

Dear Sir:

The articles on the teaching of Menno Simons as to the Incarnation are full of interest. May I offer one note as to some English facts alluded to on page 201 (July, 1930)? For the Baptist Historical Society (of England) I had the pleasure of editing a tercentenary edition of the works of John Smyth, and for his career in the Netherlands had the privilege of studying at your library in Amsterdam.

1. John Smyth when in Amsterdam became convinced of the Biblical teaching as to believers' baptism, independently of the Mennonites, purely by the study of the New Testament.

2. Thereupon he was taunted by the Episcopalians, that he had in essence become Mennonite; why did he not join them?

3. He opened up communications with Rys and Gerrits, to see if this were feasible: each party wrote out its views and sent to the other.

4. Smyth's views were in XX Latin articles, alluded to by McGlothlin on page 54, printed first by me on pages 682 to 684 of my edition (Cambridge University Press, 2 vols. 31-6 net.) but previously translated into English in Evans' **English Baptists,** volume I, pages 253 to 254. These were sent to Rys and Gerrits that the Mennonites might consider them.

5. Simultaneously, Rys—Gerrits sent **their** views, in thirty-eight articles; Smyth and his friends saw nothing amiss in them. Several writers, before they knew the course of negotiations, credited these 38 to Smyth. Smyth and his friends simply accepted them as tolerable in the Mennonites, not as expressing their own views. They may deserve close study from your standpoint, as showing what Rys and Gerrits held in 1611 as compared with what they originally wrote in 1580.

6. Smyth and some of his friends did propose to join the Mennonites; but the latter procrastinated and practically refused.

7. Some of his English followers however resented his overtures to the Mennonites and broke off communion with him. It was this section which took his XX Latin articles, revised them into XXVII, and submitted these to the Mennonites in order to show the difference. This section translated the XXVII into English, and published them, as a manifesto before returning to England.

8. Smyth thereupon elaborated his XX into 100 English articles. He died, head of the main body of English Baptists, who published the 100 posthumously. As they decided to remain in Amsterdam, they did after a while renew their application to the Mennonites, and were at length, rather grudgingly, recognized as a sister church.

9. In the next generation, when the children of the English were all Dutch-speaking, there was a fusion of three bodies; the Waterlander Dutch, the Fleming church on the N. Z. Achter burgwal and the English church in the English Alley. The resulting Union church went to the Singel, and on its walls painted the names of the ministers of the three constituent churches. But to be quite precise, John Smyth was pastor of an English Baptist church, not of a Mennonite.

10. The 100 articles have not a single one on the Incarnation. In article 31, which deals most nearly with the topic, Smyth wrote: ". . . He was in the form of God, and thought it no robberie to be equall with God: yet he took to him the shape of a servant, the word became flesh wonderfully by the power of God in the wombe of the virgin Marie: he was of the seed of David according to the flesh . . . ." Which shows a distinctly non-Menno view, "seed of David", expressed quite independently of Menno. I agree that "Joan Boucher of Kent" had imbibed the Hofmann view which Menno adopted. Of her story I have written; she was completely isolated and had no followers. (Her real name was Knell and she was of Essex! She married a butcher called Bars, went to Calais, then to Kent.)

It may be of interest to know that the English General Baptists, descended spiritually from John Smith, kept up correspondence for nearly a century with the English who stayed in Amsterdam, and therefore with the Mennonites into whom those English merged. And it is quite in line of Mr. Burkhart's studies to know that a leader arose in Sussex, Matthew Caffin, who adopted a view very much akin to Hofmann—he never credited it to Menno. On that view he insisted so vigorously that there were grave troubles for twenty years, and two disruptions, in 1696 and 1705. After his death, no more is heard of it in that shape; but the topic continued to interest his friends, and in an English environment, with no longer any Dutch influence, it led to Arianism and Unitarianism with a few. Indeed, as all the Evangelicals withdrew, the historic machinery of the old General Baptists is now in the hands of Unitarians. They are courteous enough to drop the name "Baptist" except for a few legal purposes.

Believe me

Yours faithfully,

W. T. Whitley.

Hon. Secretary (English) Baptist Historical Society.

BOOKS

Das Notbuch der russischen Christenheit. Herausgegeben in Verbindung mit Prof. Dr. N. N. Glubokowsky, Sofia (formerly St. Petersburg); Prof. Dr. Iwan Iljin, Berlin (formerly Moscow); Prof. N. von Arseniew, Königsberg (formerly Warsaw); Prof. Dr. Hans Koch, Vienna; Prof. Dr. Fritz Lieb, Basel; und Dr. Kurt Boehme, Berlin; von Pfarrer Dr. K. Cramer, Gotha. Eckart-Verlag, Berlin-Steglitz, 1930. pp. 248, Rm. 7.20. [*The Cry of Russian Christendom.*]

This "Notbuch," this cry of Russian Christendom, is at the same time a "Notbuch" of Christendom in general, since conditions in Russia which it describes have long ceased to be Russian affairs alone and since through the events in Russia the whole question as to the validity and meaning of our Christianity is opened in a fresh way and forced upon us to be answered in the most serious manner possible. Indeed it is in the last analysis the "Notbuch" of modern civilization, of the modern man, for it is this modern man who is in the last analysis the subject of the problem which constantly forms the heart of the deepest thoughts in this book, and whose final fate as a "creature" in this universe is really being discussed, the "creature" who no longer wishes to be a creature, but a sovereign autonomous creator. And the universal significance of the discussion is by no means weakened or invalidated because the material in the book is handled as Russian material and not only as abstract and general material dealing with our modern civilization. In discussing the problems of the book as Russian problems, the noble sons of Russia who here in company with German scholars tell us with bleeding hearts of the tragedy which is taking place in the fatherland which they love so passionately, only underline this universal significance because they never lose sight of the typical character of the historic phenomenon which they are describing. That Professors Koch and Lieb, as well as others, (for Pastor Cramer who was himself German pastor in one of the German colonies in Russia it is taken for granted) join them and are able to participate in the discussion on the basis of an information which is far above the average, indicates clearly enough that the affairs in Russia have a meaning for the rest of the world, far beyond the border of Russia proper.

The question referred to above as to the validity and meaning of our Christianity (Cramer), is put before us in this book with unusual earnestness, and is answered in faith in the living God and in the Divine human person of Jesus Christ on the basis of the loving sacrificial self-revelation of God in this Christ (Cramer, page 8, and Lieb, page 208) and that in all humility, and in a way which avoids and overcomes all polemical discussion. From this point of view one should notice also the intense prayer from the suffering soul of Glubokowsky, with which the latter closes his unusually passionate discussion, unusually passionate for one who is noted for his irenic temperament, and his true Russian meekness. The meaning of the events in Russia is not found in evasion of the need ("Not"), not in rejection of what

Russian Bolshevism in cynical and brutal "state vampirism" (Lieb, page 211) seeks to destroy (historic Christianity), but in a new and fresh consciousness of the essence of Christianity, and its meaning for the world of to-day, and in an understanding that Christianity is adaptable to man as he is, not as an artificial, hypothetical man after the concept of rationalistic communism. And it is above all Fritz Lieb in his chapter on "Christendom and Bolshevism" who destroys with iron blows, as Dostojewsky also does, the deluded concept of man which a godless humanism has created and worshipped. Bolshevism, by emptying man of his divine significance leads to the loss of his human significance, by sacrificing human hope and endeavor, (page 207) "Secularized chiliasm," as also Arseniew (in his discussion, "The Inner Essence of Bolshevism") strongly emphasizes, leads to ethical nihilism, and to the enslavement of man to his present earthly world (Arseniew, page 192, "Make Yourself Comfortable Here on Earth"). Bolshevism leads ultimately to the greatest loss which man can suffer, namely the loss of freedom (page 193), which is the basis and background of life (page 199). The theme, "Humanity without Divinity leads to Bestiality" runs like a red thread through the entire book (cf. also Iljin on page 169 and especially Glubokowsky, page 38). This attitude is not to be interpreted as Pharisaism, as arrogance over against the actors on the historic Russian scene of to-day. Lieb, in order to avoid this Pharisaism (as well as because of his own convictions) speaks of the "failure" of Christianity, of its guilt, just as Glubokowsky charges Russia's "civilized neighbors" and above all her "allies" with a portion of the blame for the Soviet "crime" against the whole universe. Although this rejection of Pharisaism is emphasized, the writer's utter opposition to the revolutionary "daemonie" can not be called into question, since otherwise a Sadducaical laxity or childish romanticism would merely have to be substituted for Pharisaic arrogance. The guilty character of the movement in Russia, which is conscious of its own condemnation and therefore constantly seeks to hide its true motives and objectives in hypocritical obscurities dare not be weakened in any way, either on speculative grounds or as a concession to the "man in the street." The writers of the various chapters in the book, especially Glubokowsky, have felt it their duty to cry out the truth in all its brutal nakedness, not as a private duty, but as a duty toward the church and Christian theology. In a few places Glubokowsky has allowed himself to use language which may be justly criticized as unnecessarily sharp.

The above mentioned chapter by Glubokowsky and the one by Cramer entitled, "The Evangelical Church under the Power of the Soviets," give the factual material about the situation of Russian Christendom with the exception of Catholic Christendom in Russia. Dr. Koch describes the measures of the government in its policy toward the churches. An anonymous writer analyzes the social and economic bases of these measures, while Iljin puts the cultural consequences of these same measures upon the family in its proper light. These three chapters are entitled "State and Church in the Soviet Union," the

"Commune of the Godless," "The Ruin of Family Life in the Soviet State."

All these discussions bring outstanding material of great interest which is absolutely authentic. Cramer's warm words with which he recognizes the Mennonites and their significance in Russian Christendom demonstrates that the various Protestant groups in Russia, especially the Lutherans and the Mennonites, after all stand on the same platform, have the same needs, and must coöperate in meeting the common dangers.

Koch presents a mass of rich material from legal and other points of view, some of which unavoidably repeats material in the other chapters in the book. These repetitions lower to a certain degree the dramatic quality of the book as it is read and for this reason should be eliminated as far as possible if a new edition is issued. The content and style of the book also demand a great deal from even the educated reader.

The most worthwhile material in the book is perhaps that presented by the anonymous writer who presents an authoritative picture of the Bolshevist economic policy from the social and economic point of view. The chapter by Iljin is filled with vivid source material, like everything which he writes about the Russian revolution, and factual as it is, is nevertheless filled with a passionate quality. The fact that the book closes with a summary by Dr. Boehme of the protestant movement against religious persecution in Russia ("The Conscience of the World Against Russia") emphasizes again the fact that the entire book in the last analysis does not deal with historical problems and transient material, but with the ultimate questions of our age and generation.

Karlsruhe, Germany. —B. H. Unruh.

Ein deutscher Todesweg. Authentische Dokumente der wirtschaftlichen, kulturellen und seelischen Vernichtung des Deutschtums in der Sowjet-Union. (Die Notreihe. Heft. 1 / 2.) Zusammengestellt und bearbeitet von Dr. H. Neusatz und D. Erka. Eckart-Verlag, Berlin-Steglitz, 1930. pp. 111. Kartoniert, 3 Rm. [*A German Tragedy,* authentic documents on the economic, cultural, and spiritual destruction of the German colonies in the Soviet Union.]

The Eckart-Verlag of Berlin-Steglitz, Germany, intends to publish a series of brief monographs on the nature and results of Bolshevism. With this volume it opens the series with a double number. The volume deals with the tragedy of the German colonies in the Soviet Union. The material which has been collected in the book is of great value, and is thoroughly authentic. On pages 23-29 the terrible fate of the Mennonite village of Eichenfeld (in Russian, Dubowka) is related, which was slaughtered by the anarchistic bands in October, 1919. The closing chapter of the book contains an appeal to the German government to energetically defend the rights of the German minority in Russia against the Soviet Government. No one will be able to read this description of the

tragedy of an industrious and valuable farming class in Russia without being deeply moved.

Karlsruhe, Germany. —B. H. Unruh.

Notschreie aus Russland. 60 Briefe von Augenzeugen. C. A. Fluegge. Christliche Traktatgesellschaft, Cassel (Germany), 1930. pp. 159. [*Cries from Russia. 60 Letters from Eye-Witnesses*]

This little booklet also deals with the fate of the German colonists in Russia, but less from the national point of view than the preceding book, rather more from the personal and religious point of view. The booklet contains valuable material on present conditions in the German colonies in Russia, especially among the Mennonite and Lutheran colonies. The sixty letters which it contains are authentic epistles written from within Russia by eye-witnesses and personal participants in the affairs described, to friends and relatives in Germany. They are absolutely authentic and present a vivid picture of the horrors of the Soviet policy, as well as the state of mind of the colonists. At the same time they are a testimony to the religious loyalty and faith of the suffering protestant Christians in Russia.

Karlsruhe, Germany. —B. H. Unruh.

Bilder aus Sawjet-Russland. Von Abr. Kroeker. Mountain Lake, Minn.: A. Kroeker. Striegau in Schlesien: Th. Urban. Zweite Auflage, 1930. Pp. 160.

So much has been written about Russia in recent years that one is apt to remark, "Just another book by a traveler in Russia." But this one is different. It grows, not out of a visit of a few weeks or months, but out of the experiences of fifty-one years of life in Russia. Until the time of his leaving Russia a few years ago, Mr. Kroeker lived in Halbstadt, the center of Mennonite culture in the Ukraine—which culture his work as editor and publisher did much to further. He writes out of a wealth of experience and observation, and although his picture is dark, it is not overdrawn.

The book is what the title suggests—word pictures of persons, events and situations in the history of the Mennonites in Russia, especially since the overthrow of the Tsarist government. It gives in brief compass a good cross-section of Russian Mennonite thought and life.

Mr. Kroeker contrasts the Mennonites in Russia, who are Germans, with the real Russian peasants, who are Slavs. He pictures the peasant as simple, unschooled, slow-moving and thinking; after thousands of years of oppression by the Tartars, the Tsars and the Orthodox state church, and now by the Bolsheviks, still a serf at heart; a religious mystic, but without moral training or stamina; a victim of circumstances, but in spite of it sympathetic, hospitable and friendly.

The Mennonites who emigrated from Germany to Russia, in the time of Catherine the Great and afterward, were poor, but they were ambitious and industrious; they had the advantage of more land than

their Russian neighbors, better training, tools and equipment, which they constantly improved; and a religion which gave them stamina and character. The way in which they made the bare, treeless steppes of Russia blossom forth is nothing short of marvelous, even to an American.

Given two such groups of people, side by side, with very little intermarriage, and only a limited amount of intermingling, and the stage is set for the exploitation of the one by the other. Given the natural feeling of superiority of the one group over "nur ein Russe," and the natural envy and jealousy of the other, inflamed by war with Germany and later by the agents of the Bolsheviks, and one may expect attacks and reprisals such as the Mennonites suffered from the Machnow robber bands, the Red army and the Cheka.

The Bolshevik program is too well known to need any comment here. It suffices to say that the nature and experience of the Russian Mennonites is such that they cannot accept that program. Mr. Kroeker hints at a point in their psychology which makes the friction all the more severe and painful. It is their almost total disregard for general social and political problems—their desire to live in closed communities and not to adjust themselves to the country in which they live. This has been a problem not in Russia only. Witness the movements from Russia to Canada and the United States, from Canada to Mexico and Paraguay and back—all of which are in part due to this desire for isolation. There is something to be said for this desire for isolation, but it is almost certain to result in selfishness and misunderstandings.

Mr. Kroeker's description of what the Bolshevik government has done to Russia is quite different from the government's description of what it is going to do for Russia. The heralded exploits of "electrifikasia," when Kitchkas on the Dnieper is to rival Niagara, the mining, manufacturing and government farming projects are still largely on paper, as they have been since 1917. And the progress that has been made—at what a cost! Not in terms of rubles, but in terms of the life-blood of the peasants who were robbed of their last food to satisfy the demands of the government. Unless one has been in Russia and seen conditions as they are, he can hardly realize how desperately poor the country has become. As Mr. Kroeker so aptly puts it, "At the beginning the peasants were promised peace, bread and freedom; of peace they have little, of bread less, and of freedom none."

If one is interested in the great tragedy now being enacted in Russia, he will find it worth while to read Mr. Kroeker's little book.

Chicago, Illinois. —Arthur W. Slagel.

GTU Library
3 2400 00700 5030

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall